

# CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

WEDNESDAY, May 20, 1998

New York Times

May 20, 1998

Pg. 1

## Gingrich Calls For Special House Panel To Investigate 'China Connection'

By Alison Mitchell

WASHINGTON -- Saying that "very stark questions of national security" are at stake, House Speaker Newt Gingrich announced on Tuesday that he would create a special committee to investigate President Clinton's decision to waive export controls over advanced space technology to China.

Gingrich said he would propose to House Democrats that the committee be led by Rep. Christopher Cox, R-Calif., who served in the White House counsel's office under President Ronald Reagan.

He said the committee would focus on issues ranging from the recent reports that a Chinese military officer gave \$100,000 in political contributions to a Democratic fundraiser during the 1996 presidential election to the question of whether an American satellite maker passed sensitive technological information to China.

"This has nothing to do with campaign finance," Gingrich said, seeking to elevate the issue above the recent House

investigation into Clinton's 1996 campaign financing.

"This has to do with the national security of the United States," he said, "and the effort by a foreign military to penetrate our political system and the effort by some people to give the Chinese secrets in violation of American law. This is a profoundly deeper question than anything that has arisen in this administration."

The House must vote to create a special committee, but Gingrich virtually dared the Democrats to object to such a panel, which he said would consist of five Republicans and three Democrats.

"I think the country would be very curious as to why the Democrats would not want to know that the Chinese were getting American military secrets," he said.

Rep. Dick Gephardt of Missouri, the Democratic leader, has already signaled his opposition to such a move, and a spokesman said his position has not changed. But a senior Democratic official acknowledged that boycotting such a committee "is not an option.

Some of our members are pretty spooked."

The speaker's decision to create a special committee avoids the political problem of having Rep. Dan Burton, R-Ind., continue to head a much criticized investigation into Clinton's 1996 campaign financing and allows the Republicans to elevate the inquiry into more serious matters of national security.

Gingrich's announcement came at the end of a day in which several senior Republicans wielded foreign policy as a weapon against Clinton, accusing him of undermining the stature of the presidency and assailing his handling of the Middle East, China and India. And Gingrich indirectly brought the former intern, Monica Lewinsky, into the argument, too, when he compared the Clinton White House to the salacious "Jerry Springer Show."

"Around the world today, the institution of the presidency has been degraded to the point that it is viewed as the rough equivalent of 'The Jerry Springer Show' -- a level of

disrespect and decadence that should appall every American," he wrote in the conservative weekly Human Events.

Rep. Dick Armey of Texas, the House Republican leader, said that Clinton "seems to be incapable of getting cooperation on any of the things that he is trying to get from the international community. I think it's time for him to step forward and remove this shadow of doubt that seems to be hindering his ability to achieve the stature on the international scene that an American president ought to get."

The House Republican Conference circulated talking points to House Republicans making some of the same points and saying that "this is not just another campaign finance law violation. This is the latest smudge on American international prestige. The president is losing his standing in the international community."

The talking points noted that Clinton could not convince the nation's allies at an international economic summit to join sanctions against India for con-

## To Avert Nuclear Test, U.S. Weighs Pakistan's Security Issues

Washington Post...See Pg. 2

## Protesters Reject Suharto's Proposal

Washington Post...See Pg. 3

## U.S. Forces Might Not Be Back At The Border

*Year-old shooting has drug patrols shelved*

European Stars & Stripes...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



ducting nuclear tests, and that he had trouble last year garnering international support for efforts to force weapons inspections in Iraq. And they pointed to Clinton's decision to waive sanctions against three foreign companies doing business with Iran.

Earlier in the day, at a celebration of Israel's 50th anniversary, Gingrich compared the administration's failure to stop China and Russia from transferring weapons technology to Iran to Britain's early appeasement of Hitler.

And the speaker criticized the administration for trying to broker an agreement concerning the West Bank. "When I see an American diplomat suggest to Israeli generals that our understanding of their security needs on the West Bank is better than their understanding, I'm looking at someone who has been in fancy hotels too long and out of touch with reality," he said.

But most of the Republican focus on Tuesday was on recent reports concerning China. The New York Times reported

last week that lawyers and officials have said that Johnny Chung, a Democratic fundraiser, told federal investigators that a Chinese military officer, Lt. Col. Liu Chaoying, had funneled nearly \$100,000 into Democratic campaign committees.

In addition, there have been questions about whether an American aerospace company, Loral Space and Communications, received favorable treatment on high-technology exports to China. The company's chief executive officer, Bernard Schwartz, has been one of the Democratic Party's largest donors in the last few years.

Loral and another company, Hughes Electronics, exported commercial satellites to China to be launched by Chinese missiles. After a Chinese rocket exploded in 1996, a Loral subsidiary helped provide a report to the Chinese without first consulting with U.S. officials. The company said it was cooperating with a Justice Department investigation into whether sensitive information was

passed to the Chinese.

The company has denied that any sensitive information was transferred. Clinton has denied that campaign donations affected American policy and vowed in Europe to cooperate with Congressional investigators.

House Republicans on Tuesday night pushed through a nonbinding resolution calling for immunity from prosecution for four witnesses to testify in an investigation of illegal campaign contributions to Democrats. In the debate, they raised a series of questions to be answered before Clinton goes to China in June.

Gingrich on Tuesday suggested that Clinton postpone his China trip and said the select committee could be up and running by mid-June. He said he wanted to create a separate panel because the accusations regarding China cross the jurisdiction of a number of standing committees in the House.

"If the president wants to cooperate we could begin fa-

cilitating the transfer of information within the next week or so," Gingrich said. "I would just suggest to you that implications that American military secrets were being given without the knowledge of the American government are very very serious."

In another development, a House National Security subcommittee announced that some Pentagon workers who review exports for national security risks have said that they were told by a superior not to voice their opposition to the president's approval of satellite technology transfers to China last February.

Investigators for the subcommittee said that some employees of the Pentagon's Defense Technology Security Administration told them that memos they wrote arguing against the satellite exports were suppressed by their boss in an attempt to reduce the Executive Branch's record of opposition.

Pentagon officials on Tuesday flatly denied the accusation.

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 20

## To Avert Nuclear Test, U.S. Weighs Pakistan's Security Issues

By Thomas W. Lippman  
Washington Post  
Staff Writer

India's May 11 announcement that it had tested nuclear weapons ignited a frantic effort by the Clinton administration to dissuade Pakistan from doing the same, beginning with a phone call from President Clinton to Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and an 18-hour flight to Islamabad in a windowless military plane, refueled in the air, by a high-level U.S. delegation.

More than a week later, Pakistan has not conducted what would be its first nuclear test. U.S. officials believe they may have a little breathing

room because nothing is likely to happen before Tuesday, when a Pakistani delegation arrives here for security talks.

But senior U.S. officials said Sharif may need more than Washington is able to deliver by way of security guarantees if he is going to defy domestic political pressure and refrain from testing.

Pakistan has not made specific security requests and the United States has not made any offer, the officials said. But it is clear that Pakistan cannot be deterred by threats of economic sanctions or incentives such as increased aid or the delivery of combat jets purchased long ago but never turned over to Pakistan because of restrictions

voted by Congress.

Only an ironclad commitment to defend Pakistan similar to the U.S. commitment to Japan could carry sufficient weight to persuade Pakistan not to test, Pakistani officials said, and even that might not be enough because the Pakistani public believes Washington did not do enough to deter India's five tests, they said.

When Sharif accepted Clinton's offer to send a U.S. delegation to discuss the implications of the Indian tests, Clinton dispatched Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs Karl F. "Rick" Inderfurth and Bruce Riedel, senior director for Near

East and South Asian affairs at the National Security Council. They flew to Tampa, where they were joined by Marine Corps Gen. Anthony C. Zinni, commander of the U.S. Central Command, who accompanied them on the flight to Islamabad.

In their meetings with Sharif, army Chief of Staff Gen. Jehangir Karamat and other officials, the U.S. delegation offered several arguments why Pakistan should not test, according to a participant.

Chief among them was that two "terrible mistakes" are not better than one: If Pakistan tests, it will fall into a trap set by India, forfeiting the moral high ground and taking some

### EARLY BIRD WEBSITE

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

of the international heat off India. Pakistan is much less able than India to withstand economic sanctions by the United States and other countries.

In addition, according to a participant, "We did point out to them the obvious, which is that everyone knows their [nuclear] capabilities. They don't need to prove what everyone already knows."

The delegation sent by Clinton "came and assured us that the United States wants to work with us to address our security concerns," Zamir Akram, political counselor at the Pakistani Embassy, said yesterday. "We would like to see what kind of work they are prepared to do to address our security concerns. But if this means what we have been hearing on [Capitol] Hill -- that they want to release our F-16 equipment or our F-16 planes -- and if they think that is how they want to buy Pakistan, well, I'm sorry, but they are trying to bribe us with something that belongs to us in the first place."

Because of U.S. sanctions already in place under a law known as the Pressler Amendment, Akram said, Pakistan's "conventional [military] capabilities have been greatly depleted. . . . The asymmetries are such that it is almost impossible for us to sustain a conventional war with India for any reasonable length of time, and the Indians know it. Therefore, for us, the response has to be on the basis of strategic weapons."

Faced with that kind of talk, senior administration officials have not predicted that they will be able to prevail on Pakistan not to test.

But they said it is a hopeful sign that Sharif has waited this long and appears willing to wait longer to see how the United States, China and other countries respond to India's action and whether they can develop a package of security guarantees that would ease Pakistan's fear of its bigger, more powerful neighbor.

Senior administration officials said Washington would not encourage a unilateral security commitment to Pakistan by China, which has helped Pakistan develop a nuclear

bomb, because such an arrangement could create a permanent division in South Asia between China and Pakistan on one side and India and Russia on the other.

"That's not what we're looking for China to do," a senior official said. "We do see China having a constructive role to play, along with Russia, in calming the situation in South Asia."

State Department spokesman James P. Rubin yesterday played down suggestions that Pakistan might ask the United States for security guarantees,

either unilaterally or in combination with China or other nuclear powers, because, he said, Pakistan is determined to ensure its own defense capability.

"You know, a security alliance of some major proportion might have an impact on them, but I've just not heard anybody talking about that other than journalists and commentators," Rubin said.

Pakistani diplomats, however, said Pakistan's security concerns about India -- which supported breakaway East Pakistan, now Bangladesh, in Pakistan's 1971 civil war -- will

be on the agenda for the delegation coming here next week.

Sharif is sending two political allies, Akram Zaki, chairman of the foreign relations committee in the Pakistani senate, and Syeda Abida Husain, a member of his cabinet and a former ambassador to the United States, Pakistani officials said.

"This is a big political risk for them to come here," a Pakistani diplomat said, "because people are saying there is no need, the American credibility is zero."

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 1

## Protesters Reject Suharto's Proposal

By Keith B. Richburg  
Washington Post  
Foreign Service

JAKARTA, Indonesia, May 19—Thousands of cheering, chanting students took over the grounds of Indonesia's parliament today, and the government's chief critic vowed to bring "People Power" into the streets, in a flat rejection of President Suharto's surprise plan to stage fresh elections and resign once a new leader has been named.

The protesters are demanding that Suharto step down immediately, dismissing his proposal for a gradual transition -- made in a televised speech to the nation early today -- as a stalling tactic that could allow him to cling to power for months.

The defiance of the students and the political opposition puts them at odds with the nation's powerful military, which is seen as backing Suharto's plan as a way to avoid the chaos of a leadership vacuum that an immediate resignation might bring.

On Wednesday, tens of thousands of protesters are expected to take to the streets in a new show of opposition to Suharto's rule. The military has urged organizers to call off the protest, saying it could lead to more violence like the outburst last week that destroyed thousands of buildings and cars and left 500 people dead. Tonight, Indonesian television ran warnings across the screen, telling viewers, "Do not be

enticed to join any demonstrations, because it might trigger rioting."

Tanks and armored vehicles were positioned tonight around the presidential palace and the National Monument, the planned venue for the Wednesday protests, and barbed-wire barricades were placed along a main commercial street that is the marchers' likely route.

This morning, Suharto stunned the nation by saying he had heard the calls for his resignation and had no interest in staying in power against the popular will. "There is no need to worry that I will defend my right to the presidency," Suharto said, looking relaxed and smiling benevolently. "I do not feel the honor of being a simple citizen is any less than the honor of being president. Let me not stand in the way of the desires of our people."

He then promised to set up a "reform council" that will draw up plans for new elections to be held "as quickly as possible," and said the parliament elected at that time would choose the country's new leadership. But he gave no timetable for the transition, and said that "at the moment, I remain president." He said he planned to name a "reform cabinet" to help him begin implementing needed changes.

At first, many viewed Suharto's resignation pledge as momentous, bringing an end to an era that began 32 years ago when the former general took power against the backdrop of similar economic and political

turmoil. Some analysts said his proposal for a stage-managed resignation, and his insistence on adhering to the constitution, were aimed at allowing himself a graceful, face-saving exit while leaving him some say in choosing his successor -- and enough time to guarantee that his family's considerable business interests are protected.

"That's the best thing we can have now -- the maximum we can have -- so nobody loses face," said Salim Said, a political scientist and expert on the Indonesian military. "This shows you that Suharto is still a great politician. We were about to write the requiem for Suharto. But he has found a way out that to most reasonable people is the maximum we can achieve."

Yuwono Sudharsono, an academic who joined the cabinet as minister of state for the environment in March, said that under the plan, Suharto would be out of office by the end of the year. But Yuwono, in a television interview, said Suharto was trying to balance two conflicting interests: "On the one hand, the students want him to resign immediately. On the other hand, the armed forces want to have a gradual and constitutional change." He said there were fears that a precipitous resignation "would lead to greater chaos and disintegration of the nation."

But Suharto's growing number of critics -- including the students on the streets and the opposition politicians trying to harness the popular discontent -

- viewed the president's plans for a "managed" transition with suspicion. His opponents apparently sensed they had now seized the momentum in Indonesia's political drama, and today their demands hardened: They would accept nothing less than the immediate resignation of both Suharto and his vice president, B. J. Habibie.

"We've made it very clear we want the president to step down. And that hasn't been achieved yet," said Rinaldi, 24, from Yarsi University here.

The students spoke from the expansive grounds of Indonesia's parliament, where they staged their most brazen protest to date, taking over the lawns and the buildings, sitting atop the arched roof of the legislative chambers, and occupying the meeting rooms of the adjacent office tower. They swarmed across the grounds wearing jackets in the bright colors of their schools -- yellow for the University of Indonesia, purple for the secretarial management institute, orange for Jaya Raya University, green for the Islamic University.

As they turned the legislative campus into a new and colorful focal point of opposition -- eerily reminiscent of Beijing's Tiananmen Square -- they heard speeches, performed comic skits, played guitars and beat empty plastic water bottles on the ground to a rhythmic chant. Some vowed to continue their occupation until their demands are met.

The students have taken the lead in the opposition to Suharto, often leaving the politicians trying to keep up.

Amien Rais, who has positioned himself at the forefront of the country's fractured political opposition, said Suharto was "full of illusions and hallucination" for thinking he could stay in place to manage the transition. "He will be defeated very soon," said Rais. "He does not know what is going on in his own society."

Rais, who heads Muhammadiyah, the country's second largest Muslim organization with 28 million members, repeated his vow to bring a million people onto the streets of Jakarta and other major cities

on Wednesday, the anniversary of the birth of Indonesia's nationalist movement against Dutch colonial rule. And to ease fears about a leadership vacuum in the country should Suharto step down immediately, Rais offered himself as a candidate for president, saying, "I'm more than willing to replace him."

Former cabinet member Emil Salim, also mentioned as a possible Suharto replacement, was equally critical of Suharto's proposals. "The whole time frame is so dubious -- it could be short or it could be two years," Salim said at a news conference. "The dubious time frame creates this uncertainty. Uncertainty is the exact reason we have this economic and political crisis."

Some analysts said Suharto now appeared to be a victim of more than three decades of his own aloof style, and a presidency that largely sustained itself on political intrigue and secrecy.

"There's so much logic to what he is saying, but there's so much information missing,"

said a Western diplomat. "There's a history of misinformation -- you can't ignore that," he said.

The diplomat added, "I'm highly cynical. I think it's a trick. I think he just wants to keep the cards that he's got -- stay in for a period, and manage a process that lines up his people. He's never quit, never run. In every spot he's been in, he's come up with a solution that's involved multiple deceptions."

This diplomat and others noted how when faced with the collapse of the currency, the rupiah, last October, Suharto signed a bailout agreement with the International Monetary Fund, but never implemented it. A new agreement was signed in mid-January, with Suharto pledging in writing to abolish some monopolies held by his children and close associates, and again he reneged on some of the terms almost as soon as the document was signed.

"What it all boils down to is, do you trust what this guy is saying?" the diplomat said.

European Stars &amp; Stripes

May 20, 1998

Pg. 1

## U.S. Forces Might Not Be Back At The Border

### Year-old shooting has drug patrols shelved

By Eduardo Montes  
The Associated Press

EL PASO, Texas — As the Marines approached, Esequiel Hernandez Jr. writhed on the ground in agony, dying from the military-issue M16 bullet that had torn into his side.

On that rainy evening one year ago, the 18-year-old goatherd became the first American civilian casualty of U.S. troops enlisted to fight the war on drugs. He may have been the last. The military suspended its drug patrols along the border two months later and not one armed soldier has returned since.

"We don't know when and if those missions will be reinstated. To be very honest, we don't believe they will. The entire operation was put under scrutiny. I just don't see us going back into that business," said Lt. Col. Jere Norman, spokesman for Joint Task Force Six, the agency that coordinates anti-drug missions

between the military and civilian authorities.

The Pentagon created the El Paso-based JTF Six in 1989 after the White House declared drugs a national security threat, opening the door to limited military involvement in interdiction efforts.

Civil rights advocates quickly protested, arguing the move eroded the 1878 Posse Comitatus act prohibiting the military from performing civilian law enforcement functions.

It was "against the democratic values and beliefs of this country since the Declaration of Independence," said Maria Jimenez, director of the Immigration Law Enforcement Monitoring Project, a watchdog group.

Critics also said the government was inviting tragedy, and Hernandez's death on May 20, 1997, seemed to prove them right.

Hernandez, who lived in Redford, a remote border town 200 miles southeast of El Paso,

had been grazing his goats near the Rio Grande when he crossed paths with a four-man Marine patrol assigned to keep watch on a suspected drug smuggling route.

What happened next has been a subject of debate.

The Marines said Hernandez fired at them twice with his .22-caliber rifle, prompting the camouflaged soldiers to trail him for about 20 minutes. When he raised his rifle a third time, Cpl. Clemente Banuelos, fearing a fellow Marine was in danger, fired a single shot that struck Hernandez under the right armpit. Within the hour, the teenager was dead.

Family members say Hernandez never would have knowingly fired at the Marines and that he carried the rifle only to shoot targets and protect his goats from wild dogs. Local and federal authorities acknowledge he wasn't involved in any wrongdoing when he was killed. The military maintains Banuelos and his

three fellow Marines acted appropriately. Banuelos was cleared by two grand juries, one federal and one convened by Presidio County.

The decision outraged Hernandez's family and many Redford residents.

"It's something that you can't understand, why it happened, why they had to kill him, why it had to be done," said Hernandez's older brother, Margarito. "We can't accept they had a reason to kill him. It was wrong."

The Hernandez family is pursuing a claim against the government and has been negotiating with the Justice Department for compensation, said family attorney Bill Weinacht.

And Presidio County District Attorney Albert Valadez is considering whether to reopen the case because he believes the county grand jury's examination left unanswered questions.

Margarito Hernandez and civil rights advocates are pleased that the military missions have been discontinued, but they fear the Pentagon

could reverse the decision. And in any event, JTF Six still will be involved with police, including training them in military tactics.

"It's a different threat," said Tim Dunn, author of *Militarization of the U.S.-Mexico Border*.

Supporters of military involvement see a different threat.

"We should not unilaterally retreat from the war on drugs because there is a tragedy," said Paul Marcone, chief of staff for Rep. Jim Traficant, D-Ohio. "The (suspension's)

net effect is that we have more cocaine and heroin coming into the United States."

Traficant plans to reintroduce legislation this year to allow increased military participation. But Norman, the JTF Six spokesman, said he's not sure civilian agencies want

soldiers to return.

"If it became available to us, we'd have to take a long hard look at it," said Tomas Zuniga, a Dallas-based spokesman for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. "Shame on me once, but not shame on me twice."

New York Times

May 20, 1998

## News Analysis

# China Issue Resists Usual White House Defenses

By John M. Broder

WASHINGTON -- The White House scandal control brigade has answered many a call, from Arkansas real estate deals gone sour to the Paula Jones lawsuit, and has always found a way to mount a vigorous counter-offensive.

But the silence emanating from the White House this week says that officials believe that reports of a "China connection" are different. Even James Carville, the most combative and vociferous of President Clinton's defenders, has been struck all but dumb. There is, it seems, no ready response to the accusations that a Chinese military officer sent nearly \$100,000 to Democratic campaign accounts at the same time that Clinton was overruling his own bureaucracy to relax export controls on the transfer of satellite technology to Beijing.

The disclosures of the past week are of a wholly new sort than the other accusations Clinton has faced in his five and a half years as president. This is not about business deals in the murky Arkansas past or the president's extracurricular activities. In this case, the Justice Department is investigating whether Clinton's official acts as president altered American foreign policy and affected the nation's security.

This campaign finance inquiry is also distinct from many of the investigations because it bears more directly on Vice President Al Gore's political fortunes than on the president's personal reputation. It was Gore who appeared at a Buddhist temple in Los Angeles to raise campaign cash in 1996, and Gore who has positioned himself as the high-technology candidate for the 21st century. Clinton has no more campaigns

to run; Gore has at least one.

Gore faces added scrutiny, as well, because he has for many years spoken of the dangers of proliferation of weapon and missile technology. One White House official said that he expected Republicans to try to exploit the inquiry into transfer of satellite technology to China to tarnish Gore's image.

Having survived the dismissals of the White House travel office staff, the case of the purloined FBI files, the sprawling Whitewater inquiry, the Jones suit and all its tawdry offspring, White House officials profess confidence that the president can weather the latest squall.

But there is a difference in the tone of the responses to the revelations of the administration's dealings with China. Absent are the personal attacks on the president's accusers and the cries that the charges are the product of mere partisan politics.

Instead, officials couch their denials in the narrowest possible terms or offer justifications of actions that are not in question. The official White House response to reports that Chinese-American businessman Johnny Chung transferred almost \$100,000 from an officer of China's army to the Democratic National Committee is that no one knew the true source of the money and that it was promptly returned when it was learned it came from overseas.

Officials also insist that the Chinese campaign cash has not bought a change in national policy on satellite exports. The policy switch -- made over the objection of then-Secretary of State Warren Christopher -- was to improve American "competitiveness" and to "streamline" bureaucracy, of-

ficials said.

During last year's campaign-finance hearings, White House spokesmen insisted that the administration had not traded policy benefits for big donations. Now, with evidence of a major policy shift toward China, the administration is saying that the president did not make the change because of campaign contributions.

Republicans in Congress are preparing to hold hearings on the matter in June, just before Clinton is to travel to Beijing for the first U.S.-China summit on Chinese territory since the deadly crackdown on democratic protesters in Tiananmen Square in 1989. Some Republicans are already calling on Clinton to delay or cancel the trip, which the White House has resisted.

But if the hearings produce new evidence of Chinese attempts to tamper with the 1996 election or to sway American technology transfer policy, it could undermine the president's visit, which is supposed to focus on trade and democratic liberalization in China.

A certain sign that this matter is being handled differently is the absence of the bark of Carville. With no Republicans or alleged anti-Clinton conspirators to attack, Carville, in an interview, fell back on a generic defense of the president. "In no way, shape or form do I think the President or anyone else swapped out policy for money," he said.

White House lawyers and public relations officials have discussed the new evidence of Chinese contributions at morning meetings since late last week but have not devised a strategy for responding to it.

In the ordinary course of events, the White House or its surrogates would deny the accusations, attack the integrity or credibility of the accusers and try to change the subject. The approach has served Clinton well over the years, allowing him so far to avoid serious political damage from a variety of charges.

But there has been no counterattack this time, in part because the disclosures come from within the administration, which has conducted a largely secret internal battle for years over how much to help the Chinese government in its desire to improve its satellite-launch ability.

Clinton overruled both the Justice Department and the State Department, not to reward campaign contributors from China or major U.S. aerospace firms, he insists, but to assure the economical launch of American communications satellites and to foster economic growth and political openness in China.

In brief remarks to reporters on Sunday, Clinton answered with a curt "no" when asked if he or anyone in his administration had made decisions because of the influence of Chinese money.

Prodded further, he said: "First of all, all the foreign policy decisions we made were made based on what we believed -- I and the rest of my administration -- were in the interests of the American people. Now if someone tried to influence them, that's a different issue and there ought to be an investigation into whether that happened. And I would support that."

## Pakistani-Chinese Talks Focused On Indian Tests

### Security Guarantees Seen A Key Concern

By John Pomfret  
Washington Post  
Foreign Service

BEIJING, May 19—A team of Pakistani diplomats and military officers left China today following three days of talks that focused on India's detonation of five nuclear devices last week and, Asian diplomats said, Pakistan's subsequent search for security guarantees from Beijing.

Pakistani Foreign Secretary Shamshad Ahmad returned to Islamabad after discussing "recent developments" in the region with Chinese Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan, Pakistani Embassy spokesman Rafique Dahar said. Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Zhu Bangzao told reporters that Chinese and Pakistani officials "held an extensive exchange of views on international questions and relevant regional security questions."

Neither spokesman said whether Pakistan requested specific assurances from China that it would support Islamabad in the event of an Indian attack or more Indian tests. However, Asian diplomats in Beijing said the Pakistani delegation expressed concern about alleged Indian threats to attack Pakistani-held portions of Kashmir, a mountainous territory facing China's southwestern border that is claimed by both Pakistan and India.

The Pakistani delegation also discussed with China a series of possible responses to India's decision to detonate the nuclear devices, the diplomats said.

It was unclear whether China was actively trying to persuade Pakistan not to detonate its own nuclear device in response to India's tests. Regardless, the Pakistani visit underscored China's close ties with its smaller western neighbor and China's increasingly important role in the precarious South Asian region.

When asked by reporters if China intends to try to dissuade Pakistan from conducting its own nuclear test, Zhu accused

India of undermining international efforts to ban nuclear testing. "The overriding issue for the international community is to concentrate on adopting a decisive and clear-cut position against India to prompt it to give up its nuclear program," he said.

China, which fought and won a brief border war with India in 1962, exploded a nuclear bomb in 1964 and has since conducted 45 tests. Before this week, India had conducted just one nuclear test, in 1974. Pakistan has never exploded a nuclear device but is believed to have obtained nuclear weapons blueprints and technology and also missile delivery systems from China.

A Chinese scholar said in an interview that while he did not speak for his government, he believed the international community needed to band together to give Pakistan some security guarantees to stop it from exploding a nuclear device.

"All the nuclear powers must unite in fighting nuclear proliferation," said Shen Jiru, a member of the Institute of World Economics and Politics at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing. "This could go as far as giving nonnuclear powers specific guarantees against attack -- or to guarantee a no-first-use policy against nonnuclear powers."

Shen's comments reflected a current mode of thinking in Beijing as this Asian giant begins to weigh its options following India's decision to join the nuclear club last week. China has said in the past that it will never involve itself in military alliances, send its troops abroad or play big-power politics. But the reality is that China is nevertheless becoming a big power in Asia, and smaller countries, like Pakistan, are beginning to look to it for succor while others such as India view it with dismay.

"If the price for not testing is China's assumption of the role of Pakistan's nuclear pro-

tector, it will push China into an entirely new realm of foreign relations," said David Shambaugh, a China expert and professor of political science at the Sigur Center of International Relations at George Washington University. "They are finding themselves in the position that big countries do with their close allies -- extended deterrence. Are the Chinese willing to assume that role? It's a big question."

Michael Swaine, an expert on the Chinese military at the Rand Corp., predicted China will attempt to calm Pakistan

publicly while adhering to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which Beijing signed in September 1996. "The real question, in my view, is whether or not they now decide to quietly increase the level of their assistance to Pakistan," he said. "That is a distinct possibility. Stay tuned."

China's reported assistance to Pakistan's nuclear and missile programs has been a major sticking point in U.S.-Chinese relations. In October, the Clinton administration certified, for the first time in 12 years, that China had stopped the proliferation of nuclear-weapons-related material to Pakistan. That certification opened the way for the sale of American-made nuclear-power equipment to China. So far, no sales have been made.

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 20

## Pakistani Warns On Kashmir

### Indian's Remarks Called Threatening

By Kenneth J. Cooper  
Washington Post  
Foreign Service

NEW DELHI, May 19—Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan today charged that neighboring India, emboldened by its display of nuclear might last week, has threatened to attack the Pakistani-controlled part of the disputed Himalayan territory of Kashmir.

Sharif's accusation represented his interpretation of tough remarks made Monday here in the Indian capital by the cabinet minister in charge of India's domestic security. Home Minister L.K. Advani had urged Pakistan to "realize the change in the geo-strategic situation in the region," and warned its government against trying to intensify a separatist Muslim insurgency in the Indian-controlled part of Kashmir.

Sharif, who is under heavy international pressure not to respond to India's nuclear tests with a Pakistani one, said in a nationally broadcast speech: "You must have heard today that they are discussing their aggressive designs toward Kashmir. By grace of God, we are prepared for any trial, and the whole world knows that Pakistan has the ability to de-

fend itself."

India and Pakistan have fought two wars over Kashmir since 1947, and the continuing territorial dispute stymied bilateral talks last year aimed at easing their mutual hostility.

Kashmir -- where the population is overwhelmingly Muslim -- has been a central and emotional issue for Pakistan because that Islamic republic was founded a half-century ago as a haven for the subcontinent's Muslims from Hindu domination. Across the border, India sees retention of its only Muslim-majority state as an expression of the nation's secularism, as enshrined in its constitution.

That Sharif hears provocation in Advani's remarks -- which stood out only because they closely followed India's five underground nuclear tests on May 11 and 13 -- indicates how much tensions have risen in the region in a week and how Pakistan's insecurity in face of its larger neighbor has fueled an arms race that threatens to turn into a nuclear Cold War.

Sharif called Advani and other Hindu nationalists who lead India's coalition government "fanatic fundamentalist rulers" who "would not hesitate to cross the last threshold of



aggression." He accused Advani of making "a very serious threat to Pakistan."

Some representatives of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which leads India's government after decades as a minor opposition party, appeared surprised by Sharif's strong reaction and tried to play down Advani's comments. But other BJP leaders continued the tough talk.

"We want to tell Pakistan

enough is enough now and we will not tolerate any more interference in the [Kashmir] Valley," Tourism Minister Lal Madan Khurana said in Srinagar, summer capital of India's Jammu and Kashmir state.

At the BJP's regular briefing here in the capital, Krishna Lal Sharma, a party spokesman, urged "stern action" to "convey the message across the border that the Indian government will not take anything lying down."

Washington Post May 20, 1998 Pg. 19

## FOR THE RECORD

■ **MOSCOW**—Russia's lower house of parliament, in a move sure to irritate President Boris Yeltsin, decided not to debate ratification of the START II nuclear arms reduction treaty until September. Yeltsin has been urging lawmakers to ratify the 1993 treaty soon to clear the way for new arms reduction talks with the United States and a summit meeting with President Clinton.

■ **ATHENS**—Greece rejected a call by President Clinton for a peace deal with Turkey over rights in the Aegean Sea and Cyprus, saying negotiations with Ankara were out of the question.

USA Today

May 20, 1998

Pg. 8

# A week after tests, India talks of test ban

## Tensions with Pakistan pushed to 'flash point'

By Carol Giacomo  
Reuters

WASHINGTON — India wants to reach an agreement with the international community "as soon as possible" on a nuclear test ban, its ambassador said Tuesday.

The remarks by Ambassador Naresh Chandra came a week after India conducted five nuclear tests, breaking a 25-year moratorium on nuclear testing. India had previously refused to sign the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

"We have made an offer," Chandra said. "We wish to talk and through that talk, as soon as possible, to reach a position."

Meanwhile, the tension between India and neighboring Pakistan appeared to be rising.

Pakistan charged that the West's mild response to India's nuclear tests has emboldened India's Hindu-nationalist government, which now is threatening "every day" to attack Pakistan.

"We are sitting on top of a volcano, the biggest flash point for a conflagration because of one regime's madness," Pakistani Information Minister Mushahid Hussein said.

Indian troops, trying to flush out suspected militants from a village in the state of Kashmir, shot dead four civilians and injured seven others on Tuesday.

Kashmir is the only Muslim-majority state in predominant-

ly Hindu India. Pakistan claims the territory as its own. The border is still disputed, and the two nations have fought three wars since 1947.

To prevent Pakistan from testing its own nuclear device or attacking India, the United States has offered to remove its block on the sale of 28 F-16 jet fighters to the country.

"Pakistan would benefit in its relationship, military and otherwise, with the United States if they didn't go forward and test," State Department spokesman James Rubin said.

Also Tuesday:

► *Jane's Defence Weekly* reported that India used a missile test launch on its east coast as a smoke screen to divert U.S. and Chinese intelligence, while it sneaked equipment to the opposite side of the country for nuclear tests.

India's nuclear tests were conducted at a time sandstorms normally sweep across its Thar desert and intense heat could disrupt surveillance sensors. Activity also was timed around the flights of spy satellites, Indian officials have said.

"There is no country on Earth that would disclose its strategic facilities," Chandra said. "Can you tell me one government in the world who would do something different, except a world power who doesn't care?"

► Nearly 100 Indian scientists criticized the nuclear tests.

"We do not see what immediate threats to national security forced this move, particularly when people's needs in

terms of education, health, infrastructure and industrial development are urgent," the scientists said.

Jane's Defence Weekly

## India's nuclear test preparations avoid detection

India employed a simple deceptive strategy of dodging spy satellite movement and creating a diversion to carry out its multiple underground nuclear tests at the western Alpha range desert test site in secrecy last week, said official Indian sources, writes **Rahul Bedi**.

Using indigenous remote-sensing satellites, it charted the path of KH11 and Lacrosse, the two US spy satellites responsible for surveillance over India. This enabled the test project team of around 250 army engineers and scientists from the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) to coordinate their movements to avoid detection and transfer the test control centre underground. Shortly before the first test on 11 May, a strategic deception was enacted thousands of kilometres away at the missile testing range at Chandipur-on-Sea in the east with the DRDO moving more equipment than necessary for the 37th test of the Trishul (Trident) short-range surface-to-surface missile.

Official sources said the

May 20, 1998 equipment erected at Chandipur was enough to launch Agni, India's intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) and led to US satellites focusing on the area in anticipation of a test. This also preoccupied the Chinese signals surveillance facility on Cocos Islands in the Bay of Bengal. Officials believe that continuous monitoring of Chandipur led to "complacency" in the US National Security Agency. "Seeing the same images repeatedly led the US to believe that nothing of significance was happening and by the time they switched back to cover north-western India, it was too late", said an Indian official.

"Astrology, common sense and a basic knowledge of the space environment has enabled us to beat the best technology money can buy," said an Indian Ministry of Defence official.

Official sources said the multiple tests were ready in December 1995 but abandoned after US newspapers, quoting US intelligence sources, reported the planned tests that were scheduled to coincide with negotiations at the Disarmament Conference at Geneva on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The equipment was moved underground to escape satellite detection and scientists continued secretly visiting the test site located close to Pokhran town.

# Milosevic acts to gain control over Montenegro

Tapping protege as prime minister could spark violence

By Danilo Burzan  
ASSOCIATED PRESS

PODGORICA, Yugoslavia — In a move that could lead to new bloodshed in the Balkans, President Slobodan Milosevic yesterday nominated a protege as new federal prime minister — a tactic rejected by Montenegro's parliament.

The dispute heightened the political divisions between Serbia and Montenegro, the republics that make up Yugoslavia. The two have separate parliaments and send representatives to the federal parliament.

Momir Bulatovic, chief opponent of Montenegro's reformist president, was named federal prime minister after Radoje Kontic was ousted from the post Monday by Mr. Milosevic supporters in the Yugoslav parliament.

Mr. Milosevic's nomination of Mr. Bulatovic appeared designed to thwart growing opposition to Mr. Milosevic's rule in Montenegro.

Mr. Kontic was dismissed for re-

fusing to crack down on Montenegro's pro-Western president, Milo Djukanovic, who narrowly won election as head of the republic of 600,000 last October.

Mr. Bulatovic seemed virtually certain to win the necessary approval in the federal parliament.

But Montenegro's parliament, dominated by Djukanovic supporters, said yesterday it does not recognize Mr. Kontic's ouster and would not recognize any laws made by the federal parliament in future.

It said Mr. Kontic's ouster was "a grave violation" of Montenegro's position in the federation and warned it will take "energetic measures" to preserve peace in Montenegro.

Montenegrins are deeply divided in their support for the rival camps. Bulatovic backers clashed with police supporting the newly elected Montenegrin leader in January.

Mr. Djukanovic's camp warned that Mr. Milosevic is pushing Yugoslavia toward new bloodshed

with his attempts to rein in Montenegro.

"If someone wants violence in Montenegro, he should know what to expect," Mr. Djukanovic said, indicating his police and armed supporters would be ready to defend the republic.

Mr. Djukanovic has U.S. and other Western support, and Mr. Milosevic has refused to recognize his victory over Mr. Bulatovic in the presidency election. Mr. Djukanovic met yesterday with U.S. envoy Richard Miles, who handed him a letter from Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright.

Montenegro is to hold parliamentary elections May 31. Mr. Djukanovic has said he will try to oust Mr. Milosevic as federal president if his party wins.

A new federal prime minister loyal to Mr. Milosevic could declare a state of emergency — meaning direct police or military rule — in Montenegro.

Dallas Morning News

May 20, 1998

## Colombian Government To Dismantle Controversial Army Brigade

By Tod Robberson  
The Dallas Morning News

BOGOTA, Colombia — Under pressure from the United States and international human rights groups, the Colombian government announced late Tuesday that it will dismantle a controversial army brigade accused of involvement in death-squad activities.

Army commander Gen. Manuel Jose Bonett announced he would immediately begin dismantling the 20th Intelligence Brigade, which has been accused by human rights groups of involvement in extrajudicial killings and assisting right-wing paramilitary groups

across the country.

The move follows a decision by the U.S. State Department earlier this month to revoke the visa of Gen. Ivan Ramirez, a former commander of the brigade whom Washington suspects of involvement in serious cases of human rights abuse. It was believed to be the first such action by the U.S. government in connection with a human rights case.

U.S. officials have made clear that other visa cancellations could be pending unless the Colombian government took action to investigate human rights abusers within the army.

Gen. Ramirez has repeat-

edly denied wrongdoing, telling reporters last week: "The only thing I've done is to combat violence and terrorists for 36 years. . . . I don't have any investigations pending against me."

In announcing the decision to dismantle the 20th Brigade, army commander Gen. Bonett said studies about the brigade's fate had been under way for several months as part of a "total and profound" restructuring of the army command. He said each of six intelligence units that make up the brigade would be placed under separate regional commands.

Defense Minister Gilberto Echeverri said the brigade's

dismantling had been under study since September and denied it was taken in response to international pressure.

The decision, announced as Colombians celebrated a "national day of peace," followed a week of turmoil in Bogota of a retired army commander who had urged a hard-line solution to the nation's three-decade civil conflict.

Gen. Bonett drew harsh criticism from the State Department for blaming the assassination on reports by a U.S. newspaper and a Washington human rights group alleging human rights abuses by the 20th Brigade.

Wall Street Journal May 20, 1998 Pg. 1

A Congo military court sentenced two prominent critics of the Kabila regime to prison terms of 15 and 20 years for threatening state security by violating a ban on political activity. The former army chief and opposition leader have no right of appeal.

USA Today May 20, 1998 Pg. 3

► **YORKTOWN FOUND:** Almost 56 years after being torpedoed during the Battle of Midway, the USS Yorktown was found more than 3 miles down on the Pacific floor. An expedition led by the National Geographic Society identified the aircraft carrier's gun emplacement from a Navy video.



# Indy set to return on June 7

★ Carrier group will pull into Yokosuka, Japan, home port, ending a six-month — and its final — deployment.

BY ADAM JOHNSTON

Stripes Tokyo Bureau

TOKYO — The aircraft carrier USS Independence will conclude its Persian Gulf deployment with a return to Yokosuka Naval Base, Japan, on June 7, according to a message to the crew's families recorded by skipper Capt. Mark Milliken.

Milliken recorded the message May 13 before a four-day port visit to Jubail, Saudi Arabia. In that message to Navy families, he said the current schedule called for the Navy's oldest and only overseas-based aircraft carrier to pull into

port at Yokosuka late afternoon June 7.

Jets from Carrier Air Wing 5 based at Atsugi Naval Air Facility were to fly off the Indy on June 4 or 5 "about 24 or 36 hours" before the Indy was to pull into its Yokosuka port, Milliken's message said.

"That's pretty much the schedule we have right now," Milliken said. "They've moved us along here about two to three days early. So you can just about put that in the bank."

"Like the captain said, that was the most likely schedule," Jon Nylander, a U.S. Naval Forces Japan spokesman, said Tuesday. Nylander said neither he nor 7th Fleet commanders had any official word on the ship's return.

The Indy, along with the guided missile cruiser USS Bunker Hill, the destroyer USS John S. McCain, and the Los Angeles-class attack submarine USS Charlotte, left Yokosuka on Jan. 23. The battle group was sent to the Persian Gulf amid high tensions over Saddam Hussein's refusal to let U.N. teams search for alleged weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

Milliken said in the recording that his crew is excited it has a schedule for its return home. Were it to change, he said, he would update families at the base south of Tokyo.

"Your husbands, boyfriends and others out here have done a tremendous job, we've had a good time in the port visits we've had," he said.

Five or six days before the port visit to Jubail, he said, crew members had been working hard on the flight deck with temperatures averaging about 110 degrees.

After the port visit, the ship will continue supporting the no-fly zone patrols over Iraq and then depart the Strait of Hormuz this Sunday.

On May 27, the ship will "hit the 5th Fleet-7th Fleet chop line," Milliken said.

The line, about halfway between India and Africa, marks the point where command passes from the 5th to the 7th Fleet.

The ships will then "continue on to the Okinawa op (operations) area," he said.

About 24 to 36 hours before its return to Yokosuka, according to his message, the Indy's air elements will leave the ship to return to their bases in Japan.

"We miss you very much and thanks for all your support at home."

"This is Captain Milliken, good evening," he said.

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

May 20, 1998

## 4 Ships Cancel Port Calls To Wait Near Indonesia For Possible Rescue Operations

By Dale Eisman,  
The Virginian-Pilot

WASHINGTON -- With the government of Indonesia's President Suharto rapidly imploding, the Pentagon on Tuesday readied four ships and more than 4,000 sailors and Marines for a possible mission to rescue Americans from the strife-torn country.

A Navy official confirmed that a planned port call in Pattaya, Thailand, for the amphibious ships Belleau Wood, Dubuque, Germantown and Fort McHenry has been canceled and said the ships will linger in the South China Sea to monitor the situation in Indonesia.

The ships reportedly were off the coast of Singapore on Tuesday. From there, they

could reach Jakarta in a few days.

The Japan-based ships, carrying the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit, had been headed to Thailand for an annual exercise, "Cobra Gold," with the Thai armed forces. Some 10,600 American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, along with 6,250 Thais, are to take part in the 13-day exercise, which began Tuesday.

In addition to their complement of just over 2,000 Marines, the ships involved carry about 2,100 sailors, 16 attack or assault helicopters and 6 AV-8B Harrier jump jets. To ferry Marines ashore, or perhaps to assist in an evacuation, they also have three air-cushioned landing craft, or LCACs.

The Marine units involved

routinely train for rescue missions like the one they could be called on to perform in Indonesia, where the Suharto government is increasingly unable to maintain order.

Marines from the Norfolk-based amphibious assault ship Kearsarge last year evacuated Americans trapped in Sierra Leone during disturbances in that African nation.

On Tuesday, student protesters took their calls for Suharto's ouster to the halls of the country's Parliament in Jakarta. Indonesian Army tanks were stationed outside the presidential palace, as the armed forces apparently remained the last bastion of support for the 76-year-old president.

Suharto, who took power in 1966, is the longest-serving national chief executive in Asia. He has promised to step down as soon as he reorganize his cabinet, institute major economic reforms and schedule

new elections but has set no date for his departure.

Demands for Suharto's ouster have been sparked by the collapse of his country's economy. Hundreds of Indonesians were killed when police fired on student demonstrators earlier this month but none of the violence reported to date has been directed at Americans.

Several thousand Americans live and work in Indonesia, but they've been leaving in droves during the past week as street demonstrations and violence escalated around Jakarta.

The State Department last week evacuated non-essential staff members from the U.S. embassy in Jakarta and urged other Americans remaining in the country to get out. An advisory from the embassy on Tuesday warned Americans to "avoid large crowds, demonstrations, and non-essential activities or travel."

The embassy said that Sin-

gapore Airlines has scheduled additional flights to Jakarta to handle the influx of refugees. It warned those seeking to leave

to arrive at the airport at least four hours ahead of their planned departure time.

Christian Science Monitor May 20, 1998 Pg.9

## A Few More Good Women

Ann Scott Tyson  
Special To The  
Christian Science Monitor

PARRIS ISLAND, S.C. - Thursday, April 23, 1330 hours. One, Two, Three, Four! United States Marine Corps!"

Shouting as their boots slap the wet asphalt, a platoon of marine recruits trudges down an abandoned runway as a mid afternoon cloudburst drenches this pine-forested island.

With M-16 rifles and 50 pounds of gear slung over their backs, the group at first glance could be straight out of Hollywood:

Barking drill instructors and mud-splattered troops tromping past the backdrop of a towering obstacle course.

But as the platoon reaches shelter in a cluster of wooden sea-huts on the boot camp's edge, any resemblance to movie-screen marines - slick, impervious, overdramatized - disappears.

The recruits hang their M-16s on bunks, drop to the floor, and start rubbing blistered feet. Camouflaged caps come off, revealing braids and ponytails. And a teen just out of high school asks the question on everybody's mind: "Can we have something to eat, ma'am?"

For these young women - and tens of thousands of others who have joined the Marines since the late 1940s - Parris Island is the shared point of entry, the place where romantic civilian myths of "the few and the proud" give way to rough-at-the-edges reality. Indeed, as the sole US training base for female marines, the island has long evoked mixed feelings among the women stationed here.

An idyllic, 8,000-acre expanse of evergreens and wetlands off South Carolina's coast, the historic island has served since World War I as a prime Marine training facility.

Today, some 2,500 women and 15,500 men graduate from the boot camp each year.

But ever since female recruits began arriving in 1949, Parris Island has also been the place where women encounter firsthand male hostility to their integration in the Marine Corps. In past decades, women here have faced systematic gender discrimination, sexual harassment, and unfounded accusations of lesbianism, according to official reports, legal experts, and Marine sources.

Today, the Marine base is the only US military facility where women are still segregated for basic training and have all-female instructors. Marine Corps officials say the policy prevents sexual distractions at a formative time; opponents claim it exacerbates gender inequalities. Women drop out of boot camp here at double the rate of men.

Yet despite such controversies, Parris Island remains the first, vital proving ground for women marines. For many recruits, it is the place where identities are molded, where youthful indiscretion meets the firm hand of discipline, and where physical and mental hardship breed strength and pride.

As they undergo the "Crucible" - the final, gruelling trial of a 12-week boot camp - many of the muddy young women sitting cross-legged on the sea-hut floor speak of joining the Marines as a decisive, life-transforming event.

"Back home, this recruit was daddy's little girl and she couldn't do nothin'," says Lucia Torres, a soft-spoken teen from Dallas and the daughter of Mexican immigrants. "But she always had a dream to become a marine, to be independent." (Like all recruits, Ms. Torres must refer to herself in the third person.)

For Jamie Ronan, who grew up in a tough Italian neighborhood near the railroad

yards of Newark, N.J., the Marine Corps offers a road to self-respect. "This recruit has given up on a lot of things. She hated this about herself," Ms. Ronan says. "She joined the Marines because she wanted to start something and finish it all the way through."

Tabitha Tate, from Owosso, Mich., says she was "partying" too much and slipping in college. She looked to the Marines for purpose. "It was a spur-of-the-moment decision," she says, "to do something with my life."

Drill instructor Lillian Diaz, an 11-year veteran, listens quietly as her 18 recruits finish telling their stories.

"So now we all know each other," she says, getting to her feet. "But none of that matters, does it? It doesn't matter where we came from. All that matters is that we're here now. And we're going to accomplish something. Right?"

"AYE, MA'AM!" the recruits shout back.

### 1830 hours

As the late afternoon sun casts shadows from their rifles, Sergeant Diaz marches her recruits across a soggy field, stopping in front of a huge, 15-foot-wide, 100-foot-tall vertical wooden ladder.

Known as the Stairway to Heaven, the ladder is one of 29 obstacles that recruits must tackle during the Crucible, a 54-hour ordeal that Diaz's team embarked on at 2 a.m. this morning.

The Marine Corps launched the Crucible in late 1996 as a modern-day "rite of passage," an exercise in character-building and stamina that all recruits - male and female - must complete to become marines. During the 54 hours, recruits are deprived of sleep and food, marched a total of 40 miles, and put through a gamut of problem-solving drills to promote selflessness and teamwork.

At the Stairway, a mock radio-relay site, the mission is to hoist two 50-pound metal ammunition crates to the top of the ladder and down again. The problem: Sections of the ladder, as well as its circular base, are booby-trapped. With a 2-by-4 plank and ropes as gear, the recruits have 30 minutes to

complete the task.

"Hey, let's go! Get those helmets on!" yells Sgt. Pamela Harris, another drill instructor and Diaz's partner. The women move quickly to lower the plank to the bottom rung of the ladder, making a bridge over the booby-trapped area. But they get bogged down trying to decide how to use the ropes to lift the crates.

"Start climbing or something," says one recruit.

"Yeah, do something!" urges another.

"This is messed up!" exclaims Tiffany Taylor, team leader for the exercise.

The stocky Ms. Tate volunteers to carry a rope up the ladder. But she can't see which areas are booby-trapped - painted red.

"Which way?" she yells.

"To the left!" the others shout. "Bear hug it!" "This recruit is too short!" Tate cries in exasperation. By the time she makes it half way up, the time runs out.

Down below, Sgt. Demetrius Cassellas, one of the men clocking the Crucible, shakes his head. His view - one expressed by several enlisted men here - is that women chronically fail to complete exercises, largely because they talk too much. "This happens all the time," he says. Men, he says, accomplish the mission more often.

"The females will sit there and talk about it and the males will attack it," agrees Sgt. Robert Youngblood. He and other male supervisors laughed, watching the women struggle at different events.

But Harris, Diaz, and other female drill instructors don't dwell on their success or failure. They encourage their recruits to draw lessons from how they worked together - the true test of the Crucible.

"The fact that some men are still saying that we shouldn't be here - I just ignore it," says Gunnery Sgt. Arlene Carian.

### Friday, April 24, 0800 hours

In a soft morning light, Tate, Ronan, and their group gather in a clearing in the pine forest and fasten their helmets for another "warrior station" drill. By now, most of the women have circles under their

eyes; many are yawning.

At midnight, they finished a 1-1/2-hour "hump," or night march. Reveille was four hours later at 4 a.m. And with only 2-1/2 MREs (meals-ready-to-eat) for the entire Crucible, everyone is exceedingly hungry.

Still, the stronger ones urge the stragglers on, belting out the Marine rallying cry, "OOH-RAH!"

Group cohesion is crucial for the complex maneuvers at the warrior stations. These include scaling high walls, squeezing through webs of rope, and wearing gas masks while shuffling down a path with large wooden beams held onto the feet.

This morning, recruits are trying to swing from one wooden platform to another along a string of suspended tires. But only a few women make it. Others fall off or lose momentum and hang, frustrated, in midair.

"We could do it recruits - if we had about an hour longer!" says Tate, swatting away a sand flea.

The stations teach more than physical prowess, though. With names like Laville's Duty, Timmerman's Tank, and Garcia's Leap, each one commemorates a heroic act by a marine, many of whom became martyrs. By telling these stories, drill instructors seek to instill good ethics, commitment, and courage.

At Garcia's Leap, for example, Harris watches as Veronica Connolly, a New Yorker and aspiring officer, hesitates before jumping off a stump to grab a high metal bar.

"You overcame your fear, Connolly," Harris observes afterward.

"Yes, ma'am," says Ms. Connolly.

"And you would do it again?" Harris asks.

"Yes, eventually."

"You would overcome your fear," Harris repeats, "just like Private Garcia did when he threw himself on that hand grenade."

No one says a word.

#### 0900 hours

"Ma'am, is it still morning?" Tate asks, her cheeks streaked by dirt and sweat.

Sitting on benches in a green canvas "core values" tent, Tate and the other women

look dazed as they sip strawberry juice from canteens and eat dry MREs from silver pouches.

While providing for a brief rest, the tents are also discussion sites used by the Marine Corps to promote character, mutual respect, and bonding among recruits on the Crucible. Acting as mentors, Harris and Diaz encourage the women to air problems relating to sensitive topics such as racism, drug abuse, and sexism.

"In the early 1960s, my father was a Marine Corps officer at Camp Lejeune [N.C.]," begins Harris, who is black. "He went to a diner with a Caucasian and ordered sodas. But when they brought my father's soda, they put it on the table upside down - upside down," she repeats.

The story strikes a chord with Connolly, from New York. "My grandmother is Italian, and she doesn't like black children," she says. "She calls me and my siblings 'nigger kids,' and I'm darker than the rest."

Soon, all the women are listening intently as one after another they tell of stinging discrimination, troubled families, and personal anguish.

"This recruit's grandfather was a marine in Vietnam," Tate says slowly. "But he was a family humiliation. He was such an alcoholic that we used to have to pick him up from bars. He ended up drinking alcohol they used to clean out engine parts it killed him immediately." She pauses.

"All I remember is him with a bottle."

#### 1015 hours

With bright green smoke billowing and staccato bursts of machine-gun fire simulating a battle, Tate crawls stomach down along a 150-yard obstacle course on a mission to resupply ammunition to the front line.

"I'm up! They see me! I'm down!" she yells as she rushes a few yards brandishing her M-16 and then falls flat again as if under enemy fire.

Leaping over walled mounds of grass into "tank ditches" and scraping under barbed wire, the women make rapid progress until one of them, Shayna O'Neal, is designated a casualty.

Tate, Taylor, Sonia Lee, and Khristina Tew go to the rescue. Dragging Ms. O'Neal by her arms and legs, they lurch unsteadily down the course and into the woods.

"Let's rush!" shouts Ms. Lee.

"Go! Go! Go!" yells Tate.

"I'm up! They see me! I'm down!" all four cry as artillery explodes around them.

At last, they reach the end point. O'Neal lies motionless on the ground, her eyes still closed. "Oh, thank you, Lord, thank you, Lord," she murmurs.

"We saved you, O'Neal," whispers Tate.

#### Saturday, April 25, 0630 hours

"I used to drive a Cadillac..." the recruits chant, echoing Harris's rich voice as they march over wetlands at sunrise.

"... Now I'm humping with a pack."

As a pink dawn heralds the end of the last, nine-mile march of the Crucible, no one remembers the bickering and complaints of yesterday. Instead, all minds are focused on one thing: survival.

With her oversized helmet still sliding down her forehead, Elisa Pina stumbles along the road, her hands tightly clutching the butt pack of the tall,

stringy recruit named Boothe in front of her.

Gina Salazar, a single mother from Phoenix, is limping.

Finally, at 0750 hours, the platoon rounds the corner into the main base and lines up at a replica of the Iwo Jima Memorial.

A recruit from Atlanta, Julie Taylor, is shaking as she stands at attention. Then, as the flag rises to the strains of "The Star Spangled Banner," O'Neal faints and crumples to the ground.

"You have done an awesome job on your Crucible!" booms an instructor, as paramedics hover over O'Neal. "You now know what teamwork can accomplish!"

From the loudspeaker, Lee Greenwood begins crooning the sentimental, pop tune "God Bless the USA." Diaz moves slowly down the line of recruits, shaking hands. Tears stream down Tate's face as Diaz hands her the Marines' coveted emblem, the Anchor, Globe, and Eagle.

"After my grandfather, my family all looked down on the Marine Corps," Tate says afterwards. "But I've already proved them wrong. Now, they say they are proud of me," she beams. "This is the best moment in my life."

Jane's Defence Weekly

May 20, 1998

## USAF Aircraft Monitors Fallout Of Nuclear Tests

In the wake of India's nuclear tests, the US government has dispatched a special-purpose aircraft to the region to collect atmospheric data near the underground test site.

A WC-135W from the 45th Reconnaissance Wing at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska, the US Air Force's only airborne sampling platform, was deployed to south Asia after the tests to determine the magnitude of the blasts.

US Air Force spokesman Maj Byron James confirmed only that "an aircraft of the 135 variant did deploy to monitor

the level of activity".

The aircraft, a modified Boeing 707, fulfils the 'Constant Phoenix' mission to detect and collect data on nuclear detonations. The WC-135, which has been used to monitor the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963, was deployed in 1986 to track radioactive debris after the meltdown of the Soviet nuclear reactor at Chernobyl as well as a Chinese nuclear test in the early 1990s.

The aircraft is controlled by the Air Force Technical Applications Center at Patrick Air Force Base in Florida, which provides post-detonation plume trajectory prediction, meteorological modelling and a number of advanced technologies to monitor nuclear, biological and chemical materials.

# Penalized Guard pilots seek redress

By Jennifer Harper  
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

## Lawmaker cites PC, eyes new probe

The "Boys From Syracuse" have been heard on Capitol Hill.

A group of former New York Air National Guard pilots may win a new look into a bungled military investigation that grounded their unit and trashed their careers after a female pilot said she was the victim of sexual discrimination.

"When you bow too long at the altar of political correctness, you lose all common sense," Rep. Roscoe G. Bartlett said yesterday.

The Maryland Republican has offered an amendment to the defense-authorization bill in the House. His measure calls for a Defense Department investigation of "the grounding of the 174th Fighter Wing and the subsequent dismissal, demotion or reassignment of 12 decorated combat pilots of that wing."

If the amendment is approved, the Pentagon's inspector general will have six months to submit a report to Congress.

It would be the third probe of the hotly disputed training of Maj. Jacquelyn Parker, who abruptly resigned from the 174th — a unit that had been praised for its recruitment of female and minority pilots.

Last Tuesday, the pilots surrendered 150 air medals on the steps of the Capitol to protest what they call a sham and a cover-up, comparing the investigative tactics to "the darkest days of communism." They want a new investigation to clear their names.

Maj. Parker was called the "poster girl" for gender integration, intent on becoming America's first female combat pilot.

She had considerable backing from top brass: Instructors at the 174th were told that she was "unfailable."

But Maj. Parker failed her final check ride in the F-16. She resigned from the unit in June 1995, claiming sex discrimination and reportedly threatening to "tear this unit apart."

The initial military investiga-

tion detailed an affair between Maj. Parker and her immediate supervisor, plus other sexual improprieties, including groping a male pilot who later sued her for sexual harassment.

Several fellow officers reported that Maj. Parker lied under oath during the investigation. In the aftermath, the whistleblowers lost pay and responsibility. Lt. Col. John Whiteside, then a decorated officer, said they were punished "for doing our duty as officers and [exercising] our rights as Americans."

The unit was also forced to drop its 51-year-old motto, "The Boys From Syracuse." A civil investigation followed. Maj. Parker, meanwhile, was transferred to the California Air National Guard.

A vote on the defense bill is expected later this week. If it passes, the bill will go to the Senate.

"We are grateful," said Mr. Whiteside by phone from Chicago yesterday. "The situation has taken a terrible toll on everyone, but my faith in the system is already on the mend."

## Journalists Detained at Andrews

Two radio journalists complained yesterday that soldiers at Andrews Air Force Base handcuffed, searched and detained them for six hours without access to a telephone after the reporters went there to cover a protest during Sunday's air show. They said authorities seized their tapes and film before ejecting them from the base and ordering them not to return for two years.

Amy Goodman, the host of Pacifica Radio's daily public affairs program "Democracy Now!" and a winner of the Robert F. Kennedy Award for International Reporting, said she and her producer, Jeremy Scahill, were not interfering with military police before they were detained.

Goodman said they had just finished interviewing the pilot of a B-52 bomber when five peace activists

approached the aircraft and began hammering it and spraying it with blood. She said she was recording the activists but backed off when police arrived and pushed the crowd back.

A base spokesman said Goodman and Scahill were detained and barred from the base because it was unclear whether they were involved in the protest and because they did not check in with military authorities as required. He referred questions about the confiscated tapes and film to the FBI.

The FBI has charged the five activists with damaging an aircraft, but a bureau spokesman declined to comment on the journalists' allegations yesterday.

Goodman said she and Scahill had heard only rumors about the protest. She also said they had checked with military authorities and were told they did not need special passes to cover the show.

## Alleged Spies Lose Evidence Appeal

Three Washington area residents accused of spying for East Germany and other countries lost their bid yesterday to suppress most of the government's evidence against them.

In a 21-page opinion, U.S. District Judge Claude M. Hilton wrote that FBI agents acted legally when they secretly wiretapped and searched the homes of former Pentagon lawyer Theresa M. Squillacote; her husband, Kurt Stand; and their college friend James M. Clark. Defense attorneys had argued that the FBI's

search warrants were invalid because East Germany no longer exists, so the trio could not have been active spies, as the law requires.

But Hilton found that the FBI had credible evidence to show the defendants were agents of an existing country when they obtained the search warrants in 1996 and 1997. Prosecutors declined to comment, but Stand's attorney, Richard Sauber, said, "We think we are going to win at trial, and in the unlikely event we lose, we think [this decision] is a strong basis for an appeal."

Trial is set for July 20.

*America's flawed new military doctrine.*

## Battle Wary

By Andrew J. Bacevich  
and Lawrence F. Kaplan

The Bible recounts that, after conquering Jericho, Joshua sent a party to reconnoiter toward Ai. Upon returning, the scouts assured their commander that this quarter of the Promised Land would fall easily. There would be no need to use the entire army. "Spare the whole people such a toil," the scouts urged. "The enemy are not many." Joshua detached only a token force to subdue the region. But the people of Ai, unimpressed with the reputation of Joshua's army, resisted fiercely and turned back the attackers. They pursued the Israelites to a place called Shebarim, where "they made havoc of them."

Today, the United States is ambly toward a Shebarim of its own. Barely seven years after the triumph in Desert Storm, American military thought and practice have lapsed into posturing and willful self-delusion. As a result, the world's only superpower seems bent on forfeiting its capacity to use military power effectively. The problem is not a lack of capability. The problem is confusion--at the top--regarding the utility of force as an instrument of policy.

To be sure, military activism has been emblematic of the Clinton style of governance. The president who, as a young man, loathed the military has employed it more often, for more varied purposes, and in a wider variety of circumstances than any commander-in-chief since Franklin Roosevelt: periodically flinging threats or missiles at Iraq; fighting (and losing) a small, but bloody, conflict in Somalia; dispatching troops to democratize Haiti; embarking on an open-ended deployment to Bosnia; responding (belatedly) to genocide in Rwanda; and sending U.S. forces into zones of instability from Kuwait to the Taiwan Strait.

The administration's responses to successive crises and

its justifications for those actions (or nonactions) have created an emergent military paradigm. The paradigm has four basic principles. The first is faith in technology. American military supremacy is clear-cut, genuine, and indisputable. In an earlier age, heavy industry testified to the nation's military might. Today, the U.S. comparative advantage in exploiting the information revolution for military purposes serves an analogous function. The second principle is confidence in the potential of a militarily dominant power to overawe would-be opponents in administration parlance, "diplomacy backed by force." Simply wielding the "big stick"--aircraft carriers steaming toward Taiwan or the rapid deployment of troops to Kuwait--should suffice to bring all but the most obdurate adversaries to their senses. That anyone should get hurt in the process is unnecessary, pointless, and even counterproductive.

When threats do not suffice, the U.S. uses force as a precision instrument: this is the third principle. Thus, the new paradigm inclines the United States to expend military power in increments. The ideal U.S. operation is limited in purpose, scope, duration, and effect. It minimizes the risk of casualties (whether ours or theirs), avoids collateral damage, precludes any possibility of meaningful retaliation or the danger of "quagmire," skirts moral ambiguities, and achieves its desired effect through suasion rather than brute strength. Such episodes are not to be confused with waging war, a concept that is antiquated and obsolete.

The final principle--a corollary of the third--is to employ ground forces only as a last resort. This principle manifests itself in an inclination to intervene reluctantly, late in the game, and then on a massive scale. It also manifests itself in tendencies, once troops deploy, to subordinate their nominal mission to the imperative of "force protection" and to seek

withdrawal at the earliest conceivable opportunity. The new American military paradigm values soldiers on the ground less as units of fighting power than as a constabulary or a symbol of political resolve.

This paradigm responds to multiple needs unrelated to national security as such. It comforts the sensibilities of officials who have distaste for things military but find themselves in command of a juggernaut. It testifies to their virtue and good intentions. It offers assurance that U.S. military power serves not only national interests but also the interests of all humanity. No one has espoused this view more vigorously than Madeleine Albright. During the most recent Iraq crisis, the secretary of state proclaimed: "If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We are the indispensable nation. We stand tall. We see further into the future."

Politically, the new military paradigm has served the administration well. Through an eventful first term as commander-in-chief, President Clinton violated its principles only once and suffered his sole bona fide disaster--the bloody slaughter of crack American troops by the ragtag forces of Mohammed Farah Aideed in October 1993. The president promptly cut his losses, calling off the war, bringing the troops home, and blaming the United Nations. He has not strayed from the new paradigm since.

Beyond the political realm, however, the new doctrine has had pernicious effects. Ideally, a nation's concept of how to employ military power derives from strategy; a realistic appraisal of interests and threats and of means and ends. Unfortunately, the new American military paradigm has evolved in response to political rather than strategic imperatives. Obfuscation rather than clarity has resulted. Albright's boosterism offering a case in point.

The most recent confrontation with Saddam Hussein--in which the administration conducted a de facto plebiscite on the advisability of military action against Iraq exposed the true extent of American confu-

sion over the effective employment of military power. When Saddam in late 1997 refused to submit to further U.N. weapons inspections, the administration's first response sounded tough. Clinton vowed this time that if force were required the United States would "eliminate" Iraq's capacity to produce weapons of mass destruction (WMD). An ostentatious build-up of U.S. forces in the Gulf ensued. The media reported in detail the comings (and goings) of American aircraft carriers and the movement--by quantity and type--of warplanes. Press reports described the extent and the schedule of the American deployment, provided details of which allies would (or would not) offer assistance, and assessed the capabilities and limitations of forces assembling in the region. The administration revealed everything except H-hour and the actual target plan.

Yet, even as the build-up proceeded, the Clinton paradigm began to assert itself. In order to insure the elimination of Iraq's WMD program, would the administration use ground forces? Absolutely not. Even with precision weapons, could air power alone actually destroy the entire Iraqi WMD program? Probably not. Would the administration consider targeting those elements, such as Iraq's Republican Guard, that sustained Saddam's hold on power? Not really; given the likelihood of U.S. losses and civilian casualties. The administration argued itself into a "surgical" campaign of only four or five days and approximately 500 sorties. This effort, dubbed Desert Thunder by the Pentagon, would, at most, "diminish" Iraq's WMD capabilities.

At the Pentagon on February 17, Clinton explained that Saddam "threatens the safety of his people, the stability of his region, and the security of the rest of us." If the Iraqi dictator were to succeed in acquiring weapons of mass destruction, the president declared, "some day, some way, I guarantee you, he'll use the arsenal." Yet removing this threat lay beyond U.S. capabilities. "Let me be

clear," the president said. "A military operation cannot destroy all the weapons of mass destruction capacity." At best, we could leave Saddam "significantly worse off than he is now."

The contradictions intensified the very next day at the now-notorious town-hall meeting in Columbus, Ohio. Albright, Secretary of Defense William Cohen, and national security adviser Sandy Berger tried to make the case for Desert Thunder before a national and international audience. The only sure way to get rid of Saddam was through invasion, noted Berger. But such an operation would "require a major land campaign and risk large losses of our soldiers" and was therefore unthinkable. The danger Saddam posed to America's children and grandchildren notwithstanding, "our strategic interests as a nation" would be best served simply by "containing the threat Iraq now poses."

For his part, Cohen freely acknowledged that the scaling back of American military plans had been dictated by a reluctance to accept even minimal casualties. Responding to a question posed by an American soldier, Cohen vowed, "we intend to take care of you ... we intend to minimize the risk to your lives.... We will do our level best to minimize the risk of harm." Cohen concluded: "That's why it has been very carefully circumscribed in terms of the mission itself." Nor were American casualties the only limiting factor. Berger promised that, in designing Desert Thunder, the administration had "taken every precaution that we can to minimize civilian casualties." (As Albright would write in *Newsweek*, "We care about the Iraqi people.")

What the administration really envisioned, in short, was "diplomacy backed by force." That is, it still hoped that flaunting the big stick would suffice to cow Saddam. In that sense, the administration readily conceded the initiative to its adversary, "Saddam holds the keys to ending this crisis," Cohen admitted. "He holds the keys in his hands."

The catastrophe at Columbus showed how the Clinton

team had worked itself into an untenable position. It had portrayed the threat as malignant, and, at the same time, adhering to the tenets of its military doctrine, it had opted for equivocal action. "We are talking about using military force," Albright argued, "but we are not talking about a war. That is an important distinction." But the administration's insistence upon such distinctions pointed either to embarrassing failure or unwanted escalation. As in Mogadishu, but this time with far larger consequences, the

president cut his losses. Albright flew secretly to New York to ask Kofi Annan to devise the fig leaf that would permit the United States to back down.

The effects of this episode will ripple well beyond the Persian Gulf. The defective military paradigm that gave birth to this failure is unlikely to pass away when the second Clinton term ends. It may be a principal legacy of the Clinton years, creating precedents and public expectations that could shackle the next president and

the one after that. Deluded about what can be accomplished through the mere possession of military strength, and advertising their fears as if they were virtues, those who guide the fortunes of the world's only superpower have embarked upon an experiment in virtual disarmament..

*Andrew J. Bacevich is executive director of the Foreign Policy Institute at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C. Lawrence F. Kaplan is a fellow of strategic studies at SAIS.*

USA Today

May 20, 1998

**Hype & Glory****Everything For Sale; National Security, Too?**

By Walter Shapiro

Along with his generosity to the Democratic Party, Johnny Chung boasts an instinctive sense of metaphor. The small-time Taiwanese-born businessman, who donated \$366,000 to Bill Clinton's reelection campaign, told the *Los Angeles Times* last July, "The White House is like a subway. You have to put in coins to open the gates."

What Chung neglected to mention then was that the Chinese military was paying for his tokens. Chung, who pleaded guilty to campaign-related fraud charges, told the Justice Department he received \$300,000 from Liu Chao-Ying, a colonel in the People's Liberation Army, whose father had been China's top military commander.

Had the identity of Chung's Chinese paymaster come out last summer at the height of the Senate campaign hearings, it might have galvanized an apathetic nation. Here was the long-awaited first direct connection between the Chinese government and the millions raised by the Clinton-Gore campaign from mysterious Asian sources. But Friday's front-page *New York Times* story, revealing the Chinese cash conduit, came at a point when Americans are fatigued with scandals, especially those devoid of any sexual intrigue.

Skeptics may wonder what the Chinese military was trying to buy with campaign cash.

The *Times* in a followup story provided part of the answer - access to American satellite technology. In March of 1996, the president transferred to the export-happy Commerce Department authority to permit U.S. satellites to be launched from Chinese missiles. It was probably not coincidental that Bernard Schwartz, the chairman of Loral Space and Communications, one of the two U.S. satellite firms that used these Chinese rockets, was the leading soft-money donor to the Democratic Party in 1996.

Wait, there's more. The Justice Department is investigating whether Loral and Hughes Electronics illegally aided the Chinese in helping them diagnose the cause of a 1996 rocket explosion. Loral has denied that American firms shared classified information with the Chinese. But China has long-time technology ties with Pakistan. Some suspect that the geopolitical fears that helped prompt India's nuclear tests may be linked to a leak of American technology from the Chinese to the Pakistanis.

Many of these connections, of course, are highly speculative. So let's return to the hard evidence: Johnny Chung's admission that he passed on Chinese money (which was later returned) to the Clinton campaign. In quest of insight, I phoned Tennessee Senator Fred Thompson, who chaired the campaign hearings and first warned of a Chinese plot to influence the 1996 elections.

When I asked Thompson if he felt vindicated by Chung's confession, I was unprepared for the fury of his response. "No, I hate that word," he snapped. "I never felt I needed it. Apparently others do." OK, strike the word "vindicated."

But Thompson quickly switched to a more philosophical tone in talking about the Justice Department's belated investigation of the campaign scandals, an inquiry that only began in earnest after his hearings were over.

"I don't know whether to kiss them or slap them," he said with a laugh. "The Justice Department has an obvious conflict of interest. When you get someone like Johnny Chung, you have to squeeze them for everything they know. But that means asking him questions about Janet Reno's boss," referring to the president. Thompson's solution: appointing an independent prosecutor.

In making his somewhat opaque public charges about Chinese influence, Thompson admits that he was hamstrung by the classified information provided to his committee by the CIA and the FBI. But Thompson stressed that Chung was a minor part of the equation. "I don't want to make unnecessarily inflammatory statements," he said.

"But we dealt with a lot of people with ties to the Chinese government. And compared with them, Johnny Chung was a bit player." Among those Thompson cited were John



Huang, the still unindicted Clinton fund-raiser, and longtime presidential crony James Riady.

But with the world-weary tone of a crusader who has seen public interest flag, Thompson offered some cautionary words about the press. "My concern is that the media will jump to the

next stage of 'OK, but you haven't proved a quid pro quo,'" he said. Such iron-clad evidence is impossible, Thompson argued, "unless someone from the Chinese government confesses. And that's not going to happen." Still, Thompson plans to have investigators from the Gov-

ernmental Affairs Committee, which he chairs, look into the Chung evidence.

Clinton defenders have grown adept at ridiculing all charges against the president as either rooted in tabloid titillation, Kenneth Starr's vendetta, long-ago events in Arkansas or a right-wing conspiracy. But

this campaign scandal involves none of those convenient villains. It all harks back to a president and a White House-run re-election campaign that would do anything for a buck, perhaps, in the worst case, even jeopardize national security.

*Walter Shapiro's column appears Wednesdays and Fridays.*

Washington Times

May 20, 1998

Pg. 22

# New era arrives . . . with a bang

**PATRICK BUCHANAN**

**N**ow that India has blown the doors off of the world's nuclear club, we may just see a membership explosion. And though the CIA was caught with its satellites down by those five blasts in 72 hours, President Clinton should not have been surprised.

The Pakistanis warned the White House in April that India was going nuclear, and the Hindu-nationalist BJP party in New Delhi had declared its intention to make India a nuclear power.

Moreover, India has long had the most powerful of motives: isolation and fear.

Among the great powers, none has fewer friends, and for good reason. Throughout the Cold War, the world's largest democracy sided with Moscow, even to the point of supporting the invasion of Afghanistan.

With the Soviet Union gone, India has no great power patron left.

Yet this Hindu nation of almost a billion people has a Muslim minority of more than 100 million and is bordered by Islamic states east and west. Its northern neighbor, China, attacked it in 1962 and lays claim to what India believes is sovereign territory. China has also transferred both nuclear and missile technology to India's great enemy, Pakistan, and yet been coddled by Bill Clinton's America.

In the event of a second war with China, or a fourth war with Pakistan, India would be without allies. Hence, New Delhi decided to purchase the ultimate security blanket — nuclear weapons.

Nor was the risk all that great. After all, India saw how North

Korea not only went unpunished for attempting to build atomic weapons but was rewarded with \$5 billion in aid. As for the threat of sanctions, India has seen U.S. sanctions on Cuba, Libya, Iraq and Iran all denounced or circumvented by America's own NATO allies.

India's gamble has already paid off. Overnight, the BJP party has made itself the repository of Indian nationalism. The people are ecstatic, and at the Western economic summit, France, Russia and Britain refused to support a U.S. call for economic sanctions.

Before damning New Delhi, we should put ourselves in India's shoes. If America had a nuclear-armed China to its north, which was providing nuclear and missile technology to a revenge-minded Mexico, would we follow the counsel of some distant busybody that was demanding we forever deny ourselves a nuclear deterrent?

Last week was a revealing one in post-Cold War history. It demonstrated that Western solidarity is disintegrating, that the old world of power politics has not yet given way to the new world of the Global Economy and that nationalism, while vanishing in Europe, is vibrant in Asia.

The 21st century promises to look like nothing so much as the 20th, with the difference being that the great conflicts of the future are likely to explode in the East rather than in the West.

But as we should understand India's perspective, we need to appreciate Pakistan's as well. Islamabad sees in India a hostile neighbor of 950 million, ruled by a militant party full of nationalist bravado after having tested four atomic weapons and even a hydrogen bomb.

If Pakistan does not acquire its own nuclear arsenal, it risks being subject to nuclear blackmail. Unlike South Korea and Japan, Pakistan does not have a treaty guarantee that, in the event of war, the United States will extend a nuclear umbrella over it and retaliate against any who attack it. With the CENTO and SEATO military alliances in the 1950s, Pakistan may have felt it had such a guarantee. It does not today, and neither China nor America is likely to offer one.

If Pakistan wishes to remain the master of its own destiny, a nuclear deterrent appears the only way out. Yet, if Pakistan becomes the first Islamic nation to go nuclear, it will not be the last. Iran and Turkey are rivals for primacy in the Muslim world, and Iraq has its own hegemonic ambitions. Pakistan's explosion of an atomic bomb would almost certainly set off a nuclear arms race in Asia, if India's explosions have not already done so.

For the Clinton administration, it was an awful week. The Israeli prime minister ignored Mr. Clinton's insistence that he give up 13 percent of the West Bank to keep the Oslo peace process alive. The International Monetary Fund program in Indonesia blew up in riots. President Bush's 1992 threat of military action against Belgrade, if it crushed Kosovo, was defied. The U.S. non-proliferation policy was blasted to smithereens, and America's call for sanctions on New Delhi was ignored by Europe.

The world's last superpower seems a good deal less so today.

While America cannot abandon the idea of limiting the spread of atomic weapons, it's time to put less faith in the policy than in our own deterrent and a missile defense for America and its allies.

*Patrick J. Buchanan is a nationally syndicated columnist.*

# Test of our deterrence

MAC THORNBERRY

India's explosion of five nuclear devices last week raised a number of complications for U.S. policies and objectives. But it should also remind us of the essential role our own nuclear deterrent plays in our security, and should serve to reinforce our determination to see that our nuclear arsenal is kept safe and reliable. For it is our nuclear deterrent that creates the security umbrella under which the rest of our defense efforts operate.

In addition to reflecting the regional distrust and resulting arms competition, India's test reflects its desire to be a major power. Developing nuclear weapons is the surest, shortest way to major power status, and no treaty or economic sanction will stop a country that believes it is in its national interest to acquire them. The fact that India detonated five nuclear devices, brazenly announcing the tests despite the strong international pressure against testing, should dispel once and for all the arguments of those who say the U.S. no longer needs nuclear weapons — that we've outgrown them.

In a world where a number of nations are actively seeking or developing a nuclear capability, where a greater number possess or are developing chemical and biological weapons, and where missiles to deliver these weapons are cheap and available, our nuclear deterrent will continue to be essential to our security. From the lack of political stability in Russia, to the aggressive efforts of China to improve its technology, to the many other nations and groups wanting to join the nuclear club, the dangers are not diminishing. We can, and should, try to slow the proliferation of this capability. But there can be little doubt that this capability will spread — which only increases the importance of our own nuclear

deterrent.

Yet, we face enormous challenges just keeping our deterrent safe and reliable. Our nuclear weapons were designed to last about 20 years and are fast approaching the end of their design life. Like all machines, they change with age and conditions. But they do so in ways we do not yet fully understand. The U.S. decision to ban nuclear testing not only prevents us from developing new nuclear weapons, but keeps us from testing the ones we already have to see if problems exist. It is as if we have a fleet of cars, exposed to the elements for 20 years, which we must keep ready to drive but can never actually start to see if they even run.

Instead of actual testing, the United States has chosen to rely on a program that involves using new and expensive diagnostic machines, conducting experiments on component parts, and developing advanced computing power to simulate nuclear explosions. The program is called Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship. It is expensive, and no one knows for sure if it will actually work. But in choosing to forgo nuclear testing, the administration has bet the farm on it.

We also face the challenge of maintaining the ability to build all or part of a nuclear weapon. Many of the facilities that made components have closed, and today we could not build all of the parts required for a weapon. What happens if a safety problem develops in one of the parts we cannot manufacture? What happens if a design flaw is discovered which requires a type of weapon to be remanufactured? Today, we do not have good answers to these questions.

Accompanying these technological challenges is a challenge that is distinctly human. Just as the weapons in our nuclear arsenal are growing old, the people who designed them and the people who built them are aging and retiring.

Yet the technological challenges ahead are imposing, rivaled only by the Manhattan Project and the Apollo Program.

In the face of these challenges, three steps we must take to preserve a credible deterrent are:

- **Fully fund Stockpile Stewardship.** The United States must consistently and aggressively fund the Stockpile Stewardship program. The cost of the administration's program is more than \$5 billion per year, but they have requested only \$4.5 billion this year. Congress should meet this request at a minimum.

- **Maintain our capability, and resolve, to test:** The United States must maintain nuclear test readiness that would allow us to return to testing quickly if a condition within the nuclear weapons stockpile warranted such a decision. Perhaps most importantly, we must have the political will to resume testing, if we cannot maintain confidence in our weapons without it. This decision would fall most heavily on the president, defense secretary, energy secretary and the directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories.

- **Retain our capacity to build:** The United States must maintain its complex of nuclear weapons manufacturing plants so we can replace parts we know have to be replaced and prepare for the comprehensive rebuilds that we know will eventually be required.

Even with all of the changes in the world, the events of this week remind us that we cannot go backward and uninvent nuclear weapons. For 50 years our security has rested on a safe, reliable, effective nuclear deterrent. Keeping that deterrent strong will be a key part of our security challenge for at least the next 50 years.

*Mac Thornberry, Texas Republican, is a member of the House National Security Committee, which has jurisdiction over the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.*

COLUMN LEFT

Los Angeles Times

May 19, 1998

## Ban Nukes--and Start Here at Home

*It is hypocritical for the U.S. to say it has the right to possess such weapons and others don't.*

By Robert Scheer

If it weren't so tragic, it would be a joke. India dares to test a few crude nuclear bombs and the United States, which

has 8,000 strategic warheads mounted on sophisticated launching devices aimed at targets throughout the world, is outraged.

The largest of the Indian

tests involved the equivalent of 43,000 tons of TNT, a small hydrogen bomb by U.S. standards. The "father" of the hydrogen bomb, Edward Teller, was honored with a national

medal by President Reagan. Before the U.S. reluctantly accepted a ban on nuclear testing, we spent decades setting off explosions that ranged into

the millions of tons of TNT.

Of course, it is dangerous nonsense for India to think nuclear weapons can provide peace through deterrence; an Asian nuclear arms race is a prescription for the end of the world. But what hypocrisy for the president of the United States, the only country ever to use nuclear weapons as an implement of war, to deny other nations the same opportunity to "defend" themselves. Even now, our national weapons labs are pioneering ever deadlier nuclear weapons using computer simulations beyond the technological abilities of less-developed countries like India.

We are the ones who invented the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, believed as a matter of stated national policy that nuclear war was "winnable" and continue to deploy nuclear weapons as the bedrock of our military force structure. Congress insists on spending billions on Teller's nuclear war-fighting pipe dream euphemistically called the Strategic Defense Initiative, and we still build stealth bombers and submarines whose only real military function is to fight a nu-

clear war.

Did we not just expand NATO to bring even more nations under the "protection" of the U.S. nuclear umbrella? Have Germany and Japan, which condemned India, not always assumed that the U.S. would be willing to launch a nuclear holocaust to protect them? Or England and France, which insisted on joining the nuclear club just for an extra measure of "security?"

Both the Bush and Clinton administrations approved the sale to China of advanced technology helpful to guiding missiles accurately against likely targets, which certainly include India. By what measure of reason does Clinton now seek to isolate India economically while pushing for ever more extensive trade with China, which has a much longer history of testing its nuclear arsenal? Every American president since Nixon has favored communist China over democratic India. It is not surprising that 90% of the Indian public feels sufficiently threatened to tell pollsters that they favor the development of a nuclear deterrent.

Despite the end of the Cold War, our country under both Republican and Democratic administrations has failed to move toward or even endorse the goal of abolishing nuclear weapons. As Jonathan Schell warned in a seminal article in the *Nation* magazine, the "underlying strategic doctrine of the Cold War--the doctrine of deterrence--has remained in place."

As long as the Clinton administration continues to assert this nation's right to possess and threaten the use of nuclear weapons, we have no moral, legal or logical basis for telling others not to do the same. The only path to sanity is to call for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

In his important new book, "The Gift of Time," Schell quotes extensively from a long list of veterans of America's nuclear establishment supporting the case for abolishing these weapons. The cause has been taken up by the Physicians For Social Responsibility, which won the Nobel Peace Prize for its anti-nuclear weapons activity a decade ago, but the mass media and leading

politicians have proved largely indifferent.

The explosions in India should shock us out of our complacency. The real danger is far less from India, which is a functioning democracy, than from rogue states and insurgent forces that exist only to disturb the peace of others.

The collapse of the Soviet Union has made the technology of mass destruction far more accessible to those willing to risk all for profit or fanaticism. The deadly ingredients stolen from Russia and capable of destroying whole cities turn up at random throughout the world. Why do we continue to bankroll Russia when it has failed to ratify the START II arms reduction treaty that Boris Yeltsin agreed to five years ago?

The United States and Russia must take the lead in eliminating their massive nuclear arsenals as part of an international campaign to end this scourge. If we can move in that direction, then the explosions in the Indian desert will prove a blessing.

**Robert Scheer is a Times contributing editor.**

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 24

## For The Record

From remarks by Naresh Chandra, India's ambassador to the United States, at a National Press Club news conference yesterday:

The latest series of tests conducted by India are a result of very considered study over a long period of time. A government entrusted with the task of providing adequate security to nearly a billion people is an

awesome one, and governments have been alive to this responsibility ever since the two states of India and Pakistan were created and the violence which accompanied that creation.

We have had the experience of [the 1962 India-China border war], where the folly of neglecting defense was brought home to the people of India, and for the first time realized that while ideals and noble

pronouncements are very good, but when it comes to security you have to see the real world as it is and not have any fancy notions or get taken in by overtures of friendship. . . .

The facts since then have shown that we are living in a very tough neighborhood. There are states near our borders [that] have their own aspirations and security considerations, and so have we. And these do not conform, quite

often. . . .

The states of this area [that] are improving their economies and strengthening their arrangements are undergoing a period of change. And when this change takes place, there is a lot of elbowing and jostling and so on, and what we are seeing in Asia is nothing new. It has happened in Europe, it has even happened in the American continent.

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 24

## Remembering Adm. Rickover

Stephen Rosenfeld's April 10 op-ed column, "Remembering the Maine," was in error -- Adm. Hyman Rickover was never a submarine commander, though he tried hard to act like one, with attendant publicity if he ventured under Antarctic ice.

He had enormous achievement in bringing nuclear propulsion to submarines, enabling continual operation at high speed underwater without hav-

ing to "come up for air" so diesel engines could recharge the boat's batteries.

When you inspected a submarine and asked the engineering chief, "How's it going, chief?" he might answer:

"Well, admiral, I've got a squeak in the stern planes, and the ship's service generator is out."

"But how's the nuclear plant?"

"Oh, admiral, that just runs!" That's performance.

And Adm. Rickover's analysis of the Maine's explosion -- that it was caused by heat from a fire in a coal bunker adjacent to a gunpowder magazine -- is persuasive; it may be right.

But using his connection with the Atomic Energy Commission to render some officers subservient and to blackball others was not admirable.

However, Adm. Rickover

put our Navy well ahead in submarine capability.

**NOEL GAYLER**  
Alexandria

*The writer, a retired admiral, is a former commander of the Atlantic Fleet's antisubmarine forces.*

**Editor's Note:** The op-ed referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 10, 1998, Pg. 9.

Portland (ME) Press-Herald

May 19, 1998

## Maine GI's war medals replaced by Cohen

Associated Press

BANGOR - Five years after Ernest Abbott's World War II medals were stolen from his home, a replacement set was given to him Monday by Defense Secretary William Cohen.

Cohen praised the World War II and Korean War veteran as a hero who put his own life at risk while trying to ensure the safety of men in his command.

Abbott, 76, used some self-deprecating humor as he ac-

cepted the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, Good Conduct Medal, Victory Medal and American Theater Campaign Medal at the Margaret Chase Smith Federal Building.

"I joined for World War II and the Korean War. That shows you my IQ," Abbott said. "On top of that, I volunteered for the infantry. The main reason I did that is because when I'm scared, I can dig a six-foot hole in a minute and a half."

Abbott, a native of South Paris, joined the Army in April 1942 and saw action in the Rhineland, Ardennes and central Europe during World War II. He was discharged with the

rank of sergeant after he was wounded in February 1945 in Holland.

Later, while attending the University of Maine, he joined the Army Reserves and ended up on active duty in Korea.

"Men like Ernie gave so much to their country, and ask so little, that it is truly an honor to be able to recognize his service," said U.S. Rep. John Baldacci, a 2nd District Democrat from Bangor, who accompanied Cohen.

Earlier, Cohen visited Bangor High School, where he presented 15 computers that were removed from Hanscom Air Force Base in Massachusetts.

The former senator did not

escape questions about renewed tensions following India's nuclear weapons tests during his hometown visit.

Asked about the possibility of an arms race in that region, Cohen said the United States should use whatever persuasion it can to deter Pakistan from exploding a test weapon. Pakistan Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub has said the nation will proceed with its own nuclear tests but other Pakistani officials said that decision is not final.

"The temptation is going to be very difficult because politically and domestically they are under enormous pressure not to allow India to dominate in that region," Cohen said.

Washington Times

May 20, 1998

Pg. B7

## Defense contractor to acquire QuesTech

By Joyzelle Davis  
BLOOMBERG NEWS

CACI International Inc. said it plans to buy QuesTech Inc. for \$35 million in cash and \$7 million in assumed debt to expand its information-security and intelligence business.

Arlington-based CACI, which specializes in simulation technology for U.S. Army war games, will pay \$18.39 for each QuesTech share, a premium of 27 percent over QuesTech's closing price yesterday of \$14.50. The purchase, which excludes QuesTech's packaging unit, will create a company with combined annual revenue of \$340 million and 4,400 U.S. and Eu-

ropean employees.

CACI, which has been looking to expand into intelligence, will gain information-security capabilities and access to the intelligence community.

"To get into that line of work, you need to have secure facilities, which QuesTech has," said Vincent Turzo, an analyst with Jefferies & Co. Inc.

The QuesTech acquisition will give CACI security clearances, as well as contract platforms and a client-relationship base, said James Allen, CACI's chief financial officer.

"This will increase our breadth of skills so that we can bid for increasingly larger government contracts," he said.

A number of security-related, information-technology companies have announced mergers and acquisitions this year. Parametric Technology Corp., which plans to buy Control Data Corp.'s ICEM Technologies unit and Nichols Research Corp., said last week that it plans to buy closely held Welkin Associates Ltd.

"Typically, the focus of mergers and acquisitions in this field has been on the Lockheed Martins of the world, but we're seeing a rash

of consolidations in the third-tier companies," said Thomas Meagher, an analyst with Ferris Baker Watts.

He said that the federal government has shifted in recent years to dealing with just a handful of companies that can handle a variety of contracts.

This will be CACI's third acquisition since November, when it purchased telecommunications-services provider Government Systems Inc. for \$33.5 million. In December, it acquired London-based AnaData Ltd., a closely held database marketing-software products company for \$2 million.

Three-fourths of CACI International's sales come from the federal government, and more than half of that was through the Department of Defense. The company had 1997 sales of \$273.0 million.

Falls Church-based QuesTech had 1997 revenues of \$78.5 million and has 700 employees. It has about 1.92 million shares outstanding.

CACI expects to complete the purchase in the next three to four months. The transaction is subject to QuesTech shareholder and regulatory approval.

San Antonio Express News  
May 19, 1998

## AF Boss Says Private Effort Won't Necessarily Spare Brooks From Ax

By Sig Christenson  
Express-News Staff Writer

The Air Force's top civilian leader shot down the notion

Monday that an untested proposal to cut costs at Brooks AFB by luring private firms to the facility could spare the base from closure.

Speaking after a tour of Brooks and a briefing with U.S. Rep. Ciro Rodriguez, Mayor Howard Peak and local businessman Bob Sanchez, acting Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters said the "city base" concept is interesting, but won't save Brooks from future Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions, or "BRACs."

"I have talked with Congressman Rodriguez and the mayor about the fact that I don't see this as BRAC-proofing," he said.

Rodriguez, D-San Antonio, earlier Monday characterized an hourlong luncheon he, Sanchez and Peak had with Peters at Brooks as "fruitful" and "real positive."

Neither Peak nor Sanchez,

who chairs the Brooks Opportunities Task Force, voiced concern late Monday about the remarks by Peters, who along with Defense Secretary William Cohen, has called for two more base closure rounds in 2001 and 2005.

"What we find encouraging is he (Peters) likes what we're doing," Sanchez said.

"Too many communities in the past, including San Antonio, have kept on whistling through the graveyard, and all that does is set us up for a rude awakening at some point," Peak said.

The task force has spent months studying ways to help the Air Force trim costs at Brooks amid a declining Defense Department budget, while making the base less vul-

nerable to closure or a shifting of critical missions elsewhere.

No formal conclusions have yet been reached by the panel.

Both Cohen and Peters have warned they could strip bases of missions if Congress fails to approve the base closure rounds, which they say are needed to generate savings that would then be used to modernize weapons systems in the next century.

Though some on Capitol Hill have seen such comments as a veiled threat, Peters on Monday said that wasn't the case.

"It's neither a threat nor a warning," he said. "It's simply, I think, the reality."

Some in San Antonio have

wondered if the Air Force is already trimming missions here.

A group of Brooks workers dubbed "the Gang of 20" claimed an Air Force lab reorganization that took effect in October was part of a Pentagon plan to close the base. Some workers, fearing a reduction-in-force, or RIF, was imminent because base officials warned them to dust off their résumés, quit their jobs at Brooks.

Another 61 Brooks workers have since retired early or voluntarily resigned. As many as 57 more face losing their jobs as a RIF looms later this year.

Peters said the city base concept "is one which I think has a lot of appeal" because

Brooks and a number of other Air Force bases have "extensive and expensive specialized facilities."

"Brooks has lots of unique lab facilities such as the centrifuge and some of the other laboratories that are there," he said. "So it makes sense to us to try to find the most efficient way to use those facilities. In many of them, we have a lot of excess time available."

While Peters did not say if Brooks has a future, Rodriguez said "we accomplished our objective, which is to educate him." He also expressed confidence that Peters is open-minded to the city base concept, which seeks to protect Brooks by finding ways for the Air Force to cut costs.

Washington Times

May 20, 1998

Pg. 24

## The U.S. loses the Gulf War after all

**I**f you can't beat 'em, join 'em. Maybe that should be the new bumper-sticker slogan for U.S. policy toward Iraq. Actually it would be more accurate if the slogan read: If you can't beat 'em, you can't beat 'em. Because it seems as if the Clinton administration is trying to find a pleasing way to get out of Dodge and stop facing off against Saddam Hussein. Keeping the pressure on Saddam's evil empire seems to be too much, already. There are complaints from officials in the Pentagon about the high cost of keeping up such a big military presence in the Persian Gulf. The UNSCOM inspectors have not completed their work, but there are U.S. allies at the United Nations who have been arguing for a while now that lifting the sanctions regime imposed after the Gulf War might be best. According to one UNSCOM official, Iraq isn't worried about the inspectors anyway. "We're no longer on their radar scopes. We're dead and [the Iraqis] know it," said a senior official. And the administration has seen no positive changes from its last few run-ins with Saddam. The man will not be scared away, and the administration doesn't seem to know what to do about that.

Apparently, Iraq itself is all too aware of the U.S. situation. On a recent visit to New York, Mohammed Saeed al-Sahaf, Iraq's foreign minister, said: "There is a fundamental shift in the dynamic in the [Middle East], and [U.S. officials] know it." Of the U.S. position, Mr. al-Sahaf said, "They have little support [in the Security Council] for the indefinite continuation of sanctions. The pressure is building." Bill Richardson, ambassador to the U.N. has even conceded that the U.S. will have "to fight" to maintain the sanctions against Iraq. "This is [Washington's] last hurrah," said the UNSCOM official. "Once [U.S. forces] leave, only a major confrontation will get them back. It has been seven years, they have lost

interest. [UNSCOM] is imploding and everybody knows it."

Come October, the pressure not to renew the sanctions will be fierce. Until recently, the U.S. stood vigorously against allowing Iraq to waltz on its commitments, most important among them, disarmament. But it looks as if the last confrontations with Saddam were so ineffectual that the administration now just wants out entirely. When Saddam attacked his own people in the north of the country, the American response was to increase the no-fly zone in the South. Last Autumn, President Clinton declared "victory" when, after a stand-off over weapons inspectors, Saddam agreed to let the inspectors do their job. Unfortunately, the Iraqi dictator made the agreement conditional on barring the inspectors from "presidential palaces." Of course, chemical, biological and other agents had already been moved to the sites now labeled off-limits, and Iraqi soldiers had the burn marks to prove it. Then, this past winter, the Clinton administration went up against Saddam again over weapons inspectors and again "won" with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan's help. But conditions were attached again. This time the negotiations prevented a military strike, but one the Clinton administration wanted to avoid at all costs. And now we have it from the inspectors that the effort to honestly determine Iraqi disarmament has become a joke (That would be Saddam Hussein you can hear all the way from Baghdad, laughing 'til he cries).

When it comes to strong international leadership, this administration has been sorely lacking. Now, it looks as if they are giving up on Iraq with the most important job left unfinished. Come October, it looks like Saddam will be free to menace his neighbors and the world once more.

## Washington Post Argentine Pleads Guilty To Hacking U.S. Networks

By Pamela Ferdinand  
Special to The  
Washington Post

BOSTON, May 19—The first computer criminal to be tracked down with the aid of a court-ordered wiretap pleaded guilty today in federal district court here to illegal wiretapping and computer crime felonies.

Julio Cesar Ardita, a 23-year-old Argentine known to authorities by his online moniker "griton" (Spanish for "screamer"), returned voluntarily to the United States more than two years after he was first accused of hacking into U.S. university and military computer networks.

Under a treaty with Argentina, Ardita could not be extradited. Sentenced today under a plea agreement to three years' probation and a \$5,000 fine, Ardita still faces charges in his homeland for intercepting tele-

phone lines, prosecutors said. He will serve his probation in Argentina.

"If we aren't vigilant, cyber-crime will turn the Internet into the Wild West of the 21st century," said Attorney General Janet Reno in a prepared statement. "The Justice Department is determined to pursue cyber-criminals at home and abroad."

Hackers often try to trespass into supposedly secure computer systems, pinpointing security weaknesses by deciphering elaborate number, letter and symbol combinations designed to protect the networks. If security is breached, users risk having everything, from private e-mail to databases, erased.

Mounting concerns about computer crimes were recently highlighted when a group of international hackers claimed to have broken into a U.S. computer system controlling military satellites, and an Israeli teenager known as the Analyzer allegedly infiltrated unclassified Pentagon files.

According to prosecutors here, Ardita hacked into Harvard University's host computer in Cambridge from his home in

Pg. 23

Buenos Aires during the summer of 1995. He then used a series of stolen university passwords and accounts to gain unauthorized access to U.S. military sites, including NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory and Ames Research Center.

Ardita obtained access to sensitive but unclassified research files on satellites, radiation and energy-related engineering, prosecutors said. He is also believed to have infiltrated Cal Tech, the University of California, Northeastern University in Boston, and international computer networks.

He told the court that he did not intend any harm, but was drawn into hacking by the challenge.

Wiretaps are typically used to monitor telephone conversations of organized crime and drug suspects. And while authorities use electronic surveillance to detect intruders on computer systems with the consent of the users, a court order became necessary in this case because Harvard could not adequately inform its network users that their communications

might be monitored.

Investigators placed the Harvard wiretap at the end of 1995, shortly after the Department of Defense detected several computer break-ins. The intrusions were traced to Harvard's host computer, which is widely available to more than 16,000 account-holders through modems and the Internet.

After analyzing the intruder's online habits, ranging from computer speech patterns to hacking tools, investigators used an electronic profile to apply for the wiretap and a high-speed monitoring computer.

"We intercepted only those communications which fit the pattern," U.S. Attorney Donald K. Stern said when charges were brought against Ardita.

Investigators eventually confirmed Ardita's online identity as "griton," tracing it to four computer systems in Buenos Aires and to an old electronic bulletin board, which listed his home telephone number. Ardita's computer equipment and files were seized by Argentine police on Dec. 28, 1995.

Washington Post

May 20, 1998

Pg. 24

## Mr. Suharto's Time To Go

PRESIDENT SUHARTO, who led Indonesia to growth and then to chaos, promises to step down but in the same breath assigns himself large tasks of political and electoral reform that may require him to stay on. This is the wrong way to keep disaster from settling upon the country the 76-year-old former five-star general has led for 32 years. Students, moral exemplars of Asia's latest instance of "People Power," look to be resuming their street protests. In the political class both critics and supporters believe change is overdue. The military, bulwark of the Suharto reign, is showing itself vulnerable to the conflicting tugs of the society whence it comes. The dead are numbered in the hundreds, the victims of the security forces being the most politically salient among them.

On only one previous occasion has postcolonial Indonesia changed leadership. That was in the events in which Mr. Suharto came to power in 1965 -- events in which the army killed a half-million people. He has since been careful to keep his grip on

power by a highly controlled process impervious to authentic public participation, let alone consent. This is not the record of someone any sensible person would want to manage the choice of Indonesia's next president. As for political and economic reform, the record is the man. The Indonesian people's lot improved in his time, but at the end collapse came. The riches that his rule brought his family and cronies are the mark of his unfitness.

The United States has long regarded Indonesia as a counterweight to Chinese power in both its Communist and national aspects. Washington has been slow to abandon its traditional closeness to an often repressive military regime. A certain respect for Indonesian society's capacity for violence also had something to do with it. But surely this is a moment when the United States can generate a bit more clarity about its favor for democratic solutions. Mr. Suharto has run out his string and should be replaced promptly by the popular choice. The army should take up an unequivocal role as guardian of the political arena, not its gendarme. Painful decisions about how to share the burdens of economic regeneration need to be made in a democratic context. People should not be wondering where the United States stands.

Baltimore Sun

May 19, 1998

Pg. 2

## 1st Air Force One jet makes last flight into retirement

The jet that carried President

John F. Kennedy's body from Dallas and President Richard M. Nixon to China makes a final flight today -- into retirement.

After 35 years of service, the Air Force has decided the Boeing 707

is too expensive to maintain. Because of its storied past, the first jet-powered Air Force One will fly to Dayton, Ohio, to join other historic presidential planes at Wright-Patterson Field.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE  
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500  
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)